

A VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE FOR A NON-INTEGRABLE SYSTEM

GEORG MENZ AND MARTIN TASSY

ABSTRACT. We develop a new robust technique to deduce variance principles for non-integrable discrete systems. To illustrate this technique, we show the existence of a variational principle for graph homomorphisms from $\mathbb{Z}^m$ to a d -regular tree. This seems to be the first non-trivial example of a variational principle in a non-integrable model. Instead of relying on integrability, the technique is based on a discrete Kirszbraun theorem and a concentration inequality obtained through the dynamic of the model. As a consequence of this result, we obtain the existence of a continuum of shift-invariant ergodic gradient Gibbs measures for graph homomorphisms from $\mathbb{Z}^m$ to a regular tree.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. The variational principle for graph homomorphisms	8
3. The local surface tension	16
4. Technical observations	28
5. Existence of a continuum of shift-invariant ergodic gradient Gibbs measures	49
6. Proof of the variational principle	52
7. Open problem	60
References	60

1. INTRODUCTION

The appearance of limit shapes as a limiting behavior of discrete systems is a well-known and studied phenomenon in statistical physics

Date: October 23 2016.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 82B20, 82B30, 82B41, Secondary: 60J10.

Key words and phrases. Variational principles, non-integrable models, limit shapes, domino tilings, Glauber dynamic, Azuma-Hoeffding, Gradient-Gibbs measures, entropy, concentration inequalities, Ergodic measures.

and combinatorics (e.g. [Geo88]). Among others, models that exhibit limit shapes are domino tilings and dimer models (e.g. [Kas63, CEP96, CKP01]), polymer models, lozenge tilings (e.g. [LRS01, Wil04]), Gibbs models (e.g. [She05]), the Ising model (e.g. [DKS92, Cer06]), asymmetric exclusion processes (e.g. [FS06]), sandpile models (e.g. [LP08]), the Young tableaux (e.g. [LS77, VK77, PR07]) and many more.

Limit shapes appear whenever fixed boundary conditions force a certain response of the system. The main tool to explain those shapes is a variational principle. The variational principle asymptotically characterizes the number of microscopic states, i.e. the microscopic entropy Ent_n , via a variational problem. This means that for large system sizes n , the entropy of the system is given by maximizing a macroscopic entropy $\text{Ent}(f)$ over all admissible limiting profile $f \in \mathcal{A}$. The boundary conditions are usually incorporated in the admissibility condition. In formulas, the variational principle can be expressed as (see for example Theorem 2.7)

$$\text{Ent}_n \approx \inf_{f \in \mathcal{A}} \text{Ent}(f),$$

where the macroscopic entropy

$$E(f) = \int \text{ent}(\nabla f(x)) dx$$

can be calculated via a local quantity $\text{ent}(\nabla f(x))$. This local quantity is called local surface tension in this article.

Often, a simple consequence of those variational principles is that the uniform measure on the microscopic configurations, concentrates around configurations that are close to the minimizer of the variational problem (see comments before Theorem 2.9 below). This explains the appearance of limit shapes on large scales.

In analogy to classical probability theory, one can understand the variational principle as an elaborated version of the law of large numbers. On large scales, the behavior of the system is determined by a deterministic quantity, namely the minimizer f of the macroscopic entropy. Hence, deriving a variational principle is often the first step in analyzing discrete models, before one can attempt to study other questions like the fluctuations of the model.

As a motivating example for this article serves the variational principle of domino tilings [CKP01] (see Figure 1a). It was the first variational

principle for two-dimensional random maps. It is one of the fundamental results for studying domino tilings and the other integrable discrete models. A detail analysis of the limit shapes for domino tilings was given in [KOS06].


So far, all the tools that were developed to study variational principles of discrete models rely on the integrability of the model. Up to the knowledge of the authors, there is no non-trivial example of a variational principle for which the underlying model is not integrable. However, simulations as the ones in Figure 1b, Figure 1c and Figure 1d show that those limit shapes still appear for a large class of non-integrable models. Limit shapes appear to be a universal phenomenon. The purpose of this article is to go beyond integrability and to find out what properties of a discrete system lead to variational principles and limit shapes.

In this article, we consider the non-integrable model of graph homomorphisms from $\mathbb{Z}^m$ to a d -regular tree. We choose this model because of its central role among graph homomorphisms, which stems from the fact that regular trees are the universal cover of d -regular graph with no four cycle. Hence, it provides valuable information for those systems. One should also note that the underlying lattice can have arbitrary dimension $m \geq 1$.


We identified two properties that a model of discrete maps needs to have in order to have a variational principle:

- (1) The first one is a stability property. Changes of the boundary condition on a microscopic scale do not change the macroscopic properties of the model. This allows the classification of configurations depending on the speed at which the configuration travel in the arrival space. Therefore, it implies that the macroscopic entropy $\text{Ent}(f)$ of the system is determined by a local surface tension $\text{ent}(\nabla f(x))$.
- (2) The second one is a concentration property. Else, one cannot hope that the model satisfies a variational principle which is a type of law of large numbers.


In the case of discrete integrable models, such as domino tilings or the antiferromagnetic Potts model, both properties can be deduced naturally. For deducing the first property, one uses that the space of configurations is a lattice. Then it is possible to quickly attach two configurations together provided that the boundary conditions are similar.




(A) An Aztec diamond for domino tilings. The combinatorics of the model is similar to Lipschitz functions from $\mathbb{Z}^2$ to $\mathbb{Z}$. (see [CKP01])



(B) An Aztec diamond for ribbon tilings. The combinatorics of the model is similar to Lipschitz functions from $\mathbb{Z}^2$ to $\mathbb{Z}^2$ (see [She02]).



(c) An aztec diamond tiling by 3×1 bars. The combinatorics of the model is similar to Lipschitz functions from $\mathbb{Z}^2$ to $\mathbb{Z}_3 * \mathbb{Z}_3$ (see [KK92]).



(d) An aztec diamond for Graph homomorphisms in a 3-regular tree. Each color represent one of the α_i 's introduced in Section 3.

This is done by using the minimum of two well-chosen extensions of those configurations. The second property, namely the concentration, is tackled by using a loop reversal argument or an analog version of this argument for other systems (see e.g. [CEP96, She05]).

We want to emphasize again that those arguments are based on the integrability of the underlying model and are not available for general graph homomorphisms. One of the main contribution of this article is that we provide alternative methods. These methods are not based on integrability but on weaker properties of graphs and of the underlying dynamic of the model. The authors believe that the principles behind those new arguments are robust. They should provide a possible line of attack to study variational principles and limiting behavior of a large class of non-integrable models.

Now, we discuss how the two necessary properties, namely stability and concentration, are deduced without relying on integrability.

The first property is obtained by using the discrete version of a famous theorem for continuous metric space: The Kirszbraun theorem. Up to knowledge of the authors, the first version of a discrete Kirszbraun theorem was developed in the setting of tilings in [Tas14] and [PST16]. Using a new version of the Kirszbraun theorem for graph homomorphisms allows us to show that microscopic variations of the boundary conditions can be forgotten on the macroscopic scale and thus do not influence the entropy of a system.

In order to deduce the second property, the authors combine a classical concentration inequality, namely the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, with a coupling technique relying on dynamic properties of the model. Inspiration for this type of argument comes from [CEP96], where the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality was used to show concentration for domino tilings. However, it is very difficult to apply directly the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality for more complicated models. The reason is that this needs detailed information about the structure of the underlying space of configurations. Our dynamic approach circumvents this obstacle. In our approach, one only has to understand the response of the system to changing the value of one point.

There is a natural candidate for our dynamic approach. It is the Glauber dynamic or pivot property (see [Cha16] for details). This

dynamic would be sufficient for the simpler model of graph homomorphisms to $\mathbb{Z}$. However, using the Glauber dynamic does not work for the more complicated model of graph homomorphisms to a tree $\mathcal{T}$. Heuristically, this can be understood from the observation that the simple random walk on a tree is not commutative and tends to diverge. We overcome this technical obstacle by modifying the dynamic. More precisely, we add to the original Glauber dynamic an extra non-local resampling step. Even after this modification, the Glauber dynamic does not conserve the distance between two states. We circumvent this technical obstacle by introducing a suitable quantity called depth. It turns out the modified Glauber dynamic conserves this quantity. This allows us to apply the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality and deduce concentration in this quantity. We then show that concentration in depth is sufficient for deducing our variational principle.

When deducing the variational principle for graph homomorphisms, another technical difficulty is the question of convergence of the boundary conditions. For domino tilings, there is an integer valued height function which allows to define naturally a scaling limit on the boundary. However, when the space of geodesics is more complex, as it is the case for trees, the notion of convergence is less obvious. It is a priori not clear what should be the scaling limit. This is why we had to carefully understand and define the notion of limiting profile in Theorem 2.7.

The local surface tension $\text{ent}(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ is defined as the limit of suitable chosen microscopic entropies i.e.

$$\text{ent}(s_1, \dots, s_m) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ent}_n(s_1, \dots, n).$$

We show that this limit exist by using a combination of the Kirszbraun theorem and the concentration inequality. We also show that the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ is convex. We do not know if the local surface tension is strictly convex.

One of the most noteworthy consequence of the concentration inequality is that we obtain the existence of a continuum of shift-invariant ergodic gradient Gibbs measures on tree-valued graph homomorphisms on $\mathbb{Z}^m$ as well as on any graph whose universal cover is a regular tree.

Overview over the article. In Section 2, we describe the main result of this article, namely the variational principle for graph homomorphisms to a tree. In Section 3.1, we show the existence and convexity of the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s_1, \dots, s_n)$. In Section 4, we provide

the main technical tools needed for showing the variational principle, namely the Kirszbraun theorem and the concentration inequality. In Section 5, we derive the existence of a continuum of shift-invariant ergodic gradient Gibbs measures. And finally, in Section 6 we give the proof of the variational principle.

NOTATION

- C and c denote generic positive bounded universal constants.
- $|A|$ is the cardinal of the set A .
- Usually, the letters x, y, z denote elements $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}^m$.
- $x \sim y$ indicates that the points x and y are neighbors.
- e_{xy} is the oriented edge from $x \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ to $y \in \mathbb{Z}^m$.
- d_G distance in the graph G .
- $\mathcal{T}$ denotes a d -regular tree.
- Usually, the letters w, v denote elements $w, v \in \mathcal{T}$.
- $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{T}$ denotes the root of the tree $\mathcal{T}$.
- $\mathbf{g} \subset \mathcal{T}$ denotes a geodesic of the tree $\mathcal{T}$.
- $\Pi_{\mathbf{g}} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{g}$ is the projection on the geodesic $\mathbf{g}$.
- $\infty_{\mathbf{g}}$ boundary point of the directed geodesic $\mathbf{g} \subset \mathcal{T}$.
- $\partial\mathcal{T} := \{\infty_{\mathbf{g}} : \mathbf{g} \text{ is a geodesic of } \mathcal{T}\}$.
- $\theta(\varepsilon)$ denotes a generic smooth function with $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \theta(\varepsilon) = 0$.
- α_i denotes colors of edges.
- $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$ denotes the generating set of a d -regular graph.
- $h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ is a graph homomorphism.
- $\mathcal{H}_n^g(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ is the set of all graph-homomorphism $h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ that are n -invariant with slope $s_1, \dots, s_m$ and geodesic $\mathbf{g}$.
- $\text{ent}_n(s_1, \dots, s_m) = -\frac{1}{n^2} \ln |\mathcal{H}_n^g(s_1, \dots, s_m)|$.
- $\text{ent}(s_1, \dots, s_m) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ent}_n(s_1, \dots, s_m)$.

2. THE VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE FOR GRAPH HOMOMORPHISMS

In order to formulate the variational principle, let us first clarify which model we are using.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider a finite subset $R_n \subset \mathbb{Z}^m$ of the m -dimensional lattice $\mathbb{Z}^m$. We assume that for $n \rightarrow \infty$ the scaled sublattice $\frac{1}{n}R_n$ converges to some compact, simply connected region $R \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ with Lipschitz boundary ∂R . The convergence $\frac{1}{n}R_n \rightarrow R$ is in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense.

The basic objective is to study graph homomorphisms $h : R_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$, where $\mathcal{T}$ denotes a d -regular tree:

Definition 2.1. (*Graph homomorphism, height function*) Let $\mathcal{T}$ denote the d -regular rooted tree and let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^m$ be a finite set. We denote with $d_{\mathcal{G}}$ the natural graph distance on a graph $\mathcal{G}$. A function $h : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ is called graph-homomorphism, if

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(k), h(l)) = 1$$

for all $k, l \in \Lambda$ with $d_{\mathbb{Z}^m}(k, l) = 1$. In analogy to [CKP01], we may also call h a $\mathcal{T}$ -valued height function. Let $\partial\Lambda$ denote the inner boundary of $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^m$ i.e.

$$\partial\Lambda = \{x \in \Lambda \mid \exists y \notin \Lambda : \text{dist}_{\mathbb{Z}^m}(x, y) = 1\}.$$

We call a function $h : \partial\Lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ boundary graph homomorphism or boundary height function, if it is a $\mathcal{T}$ -valued height function.

We want to study the question of how many $\mathcal{T}$ -valued height functions exist with fixed prescribed boundary height function $h_{\partial R_n} : \partial R_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$. Hence, let us consider the set $M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n})$ that is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n}) = \{ & h : R_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T} \mid h \text{ is a height function} \\ & \text{and } h(\sigma) = h_{\partial R_n}(\sigma) \quad \forall \sigma \in \partial R_n \}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The goal of the article is to derive an asymptotic formula as $n \rightarrow \infty$ of the *microscopic entropy*

$$\text{Ent}(R_n, h_{\partial R_n}) := -\frac{1}{|R_n|^2} \log M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n}). \quad (2)$$

For this purpose, let us introduce the notion of an asymptotic height profile and the notion of an asymptotic boundary height profile. Those two objects will serve as the possible limits of sequences of graph homomorphisms $h_{R_n} : R_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ and boundary graph homomorphisms $h_{\partial R_n} : \partial R_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$.

Definition 2.2 (Asymptotic height profile). Let $h_R : R \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \{1, \dots, k\}$ be a function and let $(\alpha_{i,j})_{k \times k}$ be a set of non-negative real numbers. We say that $(h_R, (\alpha_{i,j})_{k \times k})$ is an asymptotic height profile if:

- The first coordinate of the map h_R is 1-Lipschitz with respect to the l_1 -norm in the sense that for all $x, y \in R$

$$|h_R^1(x) - h_R^1(y)| \leq |x - y|_{l_1}. \quad (3)$$

- The map h_R is admissible in the sense that for all $i \neq j$:

$$\overline{h^{-1}(\mathbb{R}, i)} \cap \overline{h^{-1}(\mathbb{R}, j)} \subset \overline{h^{-1}([0, \alpha_{i,j}], \{1, \dots, k\})}, \quad (4)$$

The following interpretation is useful for understanding the notion of an asymptotic height profile $(h_R, (a_{ij})_{k \times k})$. The first coordinate $h_R^1(x)$ of the function $h : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \{1, \dots, k\}$ is interpreted as the depth or height of the point $x \in \mathbb{R}$. It plays the role of the classical height function in the variational principle for domino tilings [CKP01]. The Lipschitz condition (3) on h_R^1 is very natural and follows from the fact that graph homomorphisms are 1-Lipschitz. A similar condition also appears in [CKP01].

The second coordinate $h_R^2(x)$ indicates on which geodesic the point $x \in R$ is mapped to. The reason is that, in contrast to $\mathbb{Z}$, there are infinitely many ways to travel from zero to infinity on a tree $\mathcal{T}$. Those pathways to infinity are described by half-geodesics $\mathbf{g}$ containing the root $\mathbf{r}$ of $\mathcal{T}$.

Let us now describe the meaning of the condition (4). It has its origins in the following observation. Any two half-geodesics $\mathbf{g}_1 \subset \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathbf{g}_2 \subset \mathcal{T}$ starting in $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{T}$ have a nonzero intersection $\mathbf{g}_1 \cap \mathbf{g}_2 \neq \emptyset$. However, they must split up at some vertex $v_{12} \in \mathcal{T}$ (see also discussion below and Figure 2). If seen from the root $\mathbf{r}$, the vertex $v_{12} \in \mathcal{T}$ can be interpreted as the splitting point of the geodesics $\mathbf{g}_1$ and $\mathbf{g}_2$. If seen from infinity, the vertex $v_{12} \in \mathcal{T}$ can be interpreted as the meeting point of the geodesics $\mathbf{g}_1$ and $\mathbf{g}_2$. The number a_{12} denotes the asymptotic height of this meeting point (see also (7) in Definition 2.6). If traveling on a geodesic from infinity, it is only possible to change to the other geodesic by passing through the meeting point v_{12} . The admissibility condition (4) enforces that the asymptotic height profile has a similar property.

For an illustration of this fact, let us assume that there are points $x, y \in R$ such that the second coordinate $h_R^2(x) = 1$ and $h_R^2(y) = 2$. This indicates that the asymptotic height function h_R^1 travels at x on the geodesic $\mathbf{g}_1$ and at y on the geodesic $\mathbf{g}_2$. Now, let us consider a path $p \subset R$ from x to y . Then the asymptotic height function has to change geodesics on that path. The admissibility condition (4) enforces that changing from the geodesic $\mathbf{g}_1$ to the geodesic $\mathbf{g}_2$ can only take place at the meeting point, which is characterized by the height a_{12} .

For an illustration of an asymptotic height profile $(h_R, \alpha_{1,2})$ we refer to Figure 1. On the blue region $R_{\text{blue}} \subset R$, the height profile travels on the geodesic $\mathbf{g}_1$. On the red region $R_{\text{red}} \subset R$, the height profile travels on the geodesic $\mathbf{g}_2$. Mathematically, this means that the second




FIGURE 1. Illustration of an asymptotic height profile $(h_R, \alpha_{1,2})$.

coordinate of h_R satisfies

$$h_R^2(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in R_{\text{blue}}, \\ 2, & \text{if } x \in R_{\text{red}}. \end{cases}$$

The yellow line L_{yellow} separates the blue region R_{blue} and the red region R_{red} . The admissibility condition (4) means that one can only cross from R_{blue} to R_{red} at the meeting point of $\mathbf{g}_1$ and $\mathbf{g}_2$. Hence, the first coordinate of h_R satisfies

$$h_R^1(x) = \alpha_{1,2} \quad \text{for } x \in L_{\text{yellow}}.$$

Only the boundary condition is prescribed in a variational principle. For that reason, we now adapt Definition 2.2 and define the notion of an asymptotic boundary height profile.

Definition 2.3 (Asymptotic boundary height profile). *Let $h_{\partial R} : \partial R \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \{1, \dots, k\}$ be a function and let $(\alpha_{i,j})_{k \times k}$ be a set of non-negative real numbers. We say that $(h_{\partial R}, (\alpha_{i,j})_{k \times k})$ is an asymptotic boundary height profile if it satisfies the conditions (3) and (4) from above and the following condition. For all $x, y \in \partial R$ it holds*

$$|h_{\partial R}^1(x) - \alpha_{h_{\partial R}^2(x), h_{\partial R}^2(y)}|_{l_1} + |\alpha_{h_{\partial R}^2(x), h_{\partial R}^2(y)} - h_{\partial R}^1(y)|_{l_1} \leq |x - y|_{l_1}. \quad (5)$$

Let us make a remark why we need the additional condition (5). The condition (5) is needed to ensure that any given asymptotic boundary height profile $(h_{\partial R}, (a_{i,j}))$ on the boundary ∂R can be extended to a asymptotic height profile $(h_R, (a_{i,j}))$ on the full region R (using a Kirszbraun theorem, see also Section 4.1). This is important because

otherwise the statement of the variational principle could be empty (cf. Theorem 2.7 below).

The next step in formulating the variational principle is to define in which sense a sequence of (boundary) graph homomorphisms $h_{\partial R_n} : \partial R_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ converges to an asymptotic height profile $(h_{\partial R}, (\alpha_{i,j})_{k \times k})$.

For this purpose, let us introduce some necessary definitions.

Definition 2.4. (*Geodesic on the tree $\mathcal{T}$*) Let $\mathcal{T}$ denote the d -regular tree with root $\mathbf{r}$. A graph homomorphism $\mathbf{g} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ is called *geodesic* if the map g is one-to-one.

Let $\infty_{\mathbf{g}}$ denote a boundary point associated to a directed geodesic $\mathbf{g} \subset \mathcal{T}$ starting at the root $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{g}$. We denote with $\partial \mathcal{T}$ the set of all such boundary points i.e. (see for example [Klo08])

$$\partial \mathcal{T} := \{\infty_{\mathbf{g}} : \mathbf{g} \text{ is a one-sided geodesic of } \mathcal{T} \text{ starting in } \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{g}\}.$$

It follows from the definition that for two boundary points $\infty_{\mathbf{g}_1}, \infty_{\mathbf{g}_2} \in \partial \mathcal{T}$ there is a unique element $v_{ij} \in \mathcal{T}$ such that (cf. Figure 2)

$$\max_{v \in \mathbf{g}_1 \cap \mathbf{g}_2} d_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{r}, v) = d_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{r}, v_{ij}).$$

We will write

$$|\infty_{g_1} \cap \infty_{g_2}| := \max_{v \in \mathbf{g}_1 \cap \mathbf{g}_2} d_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{r}, v) = d_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{r}, v_{ij}), \quad (6)$$

and call $|\infty_{g_1} \cap \infty_{g_2}|$ the depth of the meeting point of the two geodesics g_1 and g_2 . We also need the following definition.

Definition 2.5. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{g} \subset \mathcal{T}$ a half-geodesic on the graph $\mathcal{T}$ starting in the root $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{T}$. Then we set

$$\mathbf{g}(n) = w \in \mathbf{g},$$

where w is the unique element $w \in \mathbf{g}$ such that

$$n = \text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}}(w, \mathbf{r})$$

We are now ready to define the convergence of a sequence of boundary graph homomorphisms to an asymptotic boundary height profile.

Definition 2.6. Let $h_{\partial R_n} : \partial R_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ be a sequence of boundary height functions and let $(h_{\partial R}, (\alpha_{i,j})_{k \times k})$ be an asymptotic boundary height profile in the sense of Definition 2.2. We say that the sequence $h_{\partial R_n}$ converges to $(h_{\partial R}, (\alpha_{i,j})_{k \times k})$ (i.e. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_{\partial R_n} = (h_{\partial R}, (\alpha_{i,j})_{k \times k})$), if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- There exist k sequences of boundary points $\{\infty_{g_{1,i}}, \dots, \infty_{g_{k,i}}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for all i, j :

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} |\infty_{g_{i,n}} \cap \infty_{g_{j,n}}| = \alpha_{i,j} \quad (7)$$

where $|\infty_{g_{i,n}} \cap \infty_{g_{j,n}}|$ is the depth of the meeting point of the two geodesics (see (6)).

- For $z \in \partial R_n$ we define the set

$$S(z) := \partial R \cap \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^m : \left| x - \frac{z}{n} \right|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2n} \right\}.$$

Then it holds that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\{z \in \partial R_n : S(z) \neq \emptyset\}} \sup_{x \in S(z)} \frac{1}{n} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}} \left(h_{\partial R_n}(z), g_{h_{\partial R}^2(x), n}(\lfloor n h_{\partial R}^1(x) \rfloor) \right) = 0. \quad (8)$$

where $h_{\partial R}^1$ and $h_{\partial R}^2$ are the two components of the function $h_{\partial R}$.

Definition 2.6 is illustrated in Figure 2. The condition (7) ensures that the quantity $\alpha_{i,j}$ characterizes the asymptotic meeting point of the geodesics $\mathbf{g}_i$ and $\mathbf{g}_j$. The condition (8) asymptotically characterizes the values of graph homomorphism $h_{\partial R_n}$ via the asymptotic height profile.


Let us now formulate the main result of this article, namely the variational principle for graph homomorphisms in a regular tree. As we outlined in the introduction, a variational principle contains two statements. The first statement, namely Theorem 2.7, gives a variational characterization of the entropy $\text{Ent}(\mathbb{R}_n, h_{\partial R_n}) = -\frac{1}{n^2} \ln M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n})$ (cf. (2)). Hence it asymptotically characterizes the number of possible graph homomorphisms $h_n \in M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n})$ with boundary data $h_{\partial R_n}$.

Theorem 2.7 (Variational principle). *We assume that $R \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is a compact, simply connected region with Lipschitz boundary ∂R . We consider a lattice discretization $R_n \subset \mathbb{Z}^m$ of R such that the rescaled sublattice $\frac{1}{n}R_n$ converges to R in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense.*

We assume that the boundary height functions $h_{\partial R_n}$ converge to an asymptotic boundary height profile $(h_{\partial R}, (\alpha_{i,j})_{k \times k})$ in the sense of Definition 2.6.

Let $\text{AHP}(h_{\partial R}, (a_{ij})_{k \times k})$ denote the set of asymptotic height profiles that extend $(h_{\partial R}, (a_{ij})_{k \times k})$ from ∂R to R .

Given an element $h_R \in \text{AHP}(h_{\partial R}, (a_{ij})_{k \times k})$, we define the macroscopic

FIGURE 2. Scaling of graph homomorphism into $\mathcal{T}_d$

entropy *via*

$$\text{Ent}(R, h_R) = \int_R \text{ent}(\nabla h_R^1(x)) dx,$$

where the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ is given by Theorem 3.1 from below. Then it holds that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Ent}(\Lambda_n, h_{\partial R_n}) = \min_{h_R \in \text{AHP}(h_{\partial R, (a_{ij})_{k \times k}})} \text{Ent}(R, h_R).$$

The local surface tension will be defined in Section 3.1 as a limit of carefully chosen entropies. Contrary to the case of domino tilings, we do not have an explicit formula for the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s_1, \dots, s_m)$. The convexity of the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ is deduced in Section 3.1. In analogy to domino tilings, the authors believe that the local surface tension is strictly convex, but they are missing a proof. As a consequence, we do not know if the minimizer of the continuous entropy is unique.

Let us now turn to the second part of the variational principle, namely the profile theorem (see Theorem 2.9 from below). The profile theorem contains information about the profile of a graph homomorphisms h_n that is chosen uniformly random from $M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n})$.

In a non-rigorous way, the statement of Theorem 2.9 is the following. Let us consider an asymptotic boundary height profile $h_R \in \text{AHP}(h_{\partial R, (a_{ij})_{k \times k}})$. Then the continuous entropy $\text{Ent}(h_R)$ is given by the number of graph homomorphisms $h_n \in M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n})$ that are




FIGURE 3. Illustration of the set R . The grid is the set $R_{\text{grid},\varepsilon}$.

close to h_R . Applying this statement to the minimizer $h_{\min}$ of the continuous entropy $\text{Ent}(h)$ has the following consequence. The uniform measure on the set of graph homomorphisms $M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n})$ concentrates on graph homomorphisms h_n that have a profile that is close to $h_{\min}$. As a consequence, a uniform sample of $M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n})$ will have a profile that is close to the minimizing profile $h_{\min}$ for large n .

Let us now make this discussion precise. For that purpose, we have to specify when the profile of a graph homomorphism h_n is close to an asymptotic height profile h .

Definition 2.8. For fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, let us consider the grid $R_{\text{grid},\varepsilon}$ with ε -spacing contained in R . More precisely, $R_{\text{grid},\varepsilon}$ is given by (see Figure 3)

$$R_{\text{grid},\varepsilon} := \{x = (z_1, \dots, x_m) \in R \mid \exists 1 \leq k \leq m : |x_k| \in \varepsilon\mathbb{N}\}.$$

For a given asymptotic height profile h , we define the ball $HP_n(h, \delta)$ of size $\delta > 0$ by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} & HP_n(h, \delta) \\ &= \left\{ h_n \in M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n}) \mid \sup_{x \in R_n : \frac{x}{n} \in R_{\text{grid},\varepsilon}} \left| \frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h_n(x), \mathbf{r}) - h^1\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) \right| \leq \delta \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the set $M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n})$ of graph homomorphisms is given by (1).

We note that the set $HP_n(h, \delta)$ for any extension h of the asymptotic boundary height profile $h_{\partial R}$ is non-empty. This follows from the Definition 2.6 of the convergence of a boundary height-function $h_{\partial R_n}$ to

the asymptotic boundary height profile $h_{\partial R}$.

Theorem 2.9. *If the asymptotic height profile $(h_R, (a_{ij})_{k \times k})$ is an extension of an asymptotic boundary height profile $(h_{\partial R}, (a_{ij})_{k \times k})$, then*

$$\text{Ent}(h) = -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h, \delta)| + \theta(\varepsilon) + \theta(\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right), \quad (10)$$

where θ denotes a generic smooth function with $\lim_{x \downarrow 0} \theta(x) = 0$.

The proof Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 2.9 is stated in Section 6. They need a lot of preparation. For example, we first have to define the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s_1, \dots, s_m)$. This is done in Section 3. There, we also show that the local surface tension is convex. The main technical tools for the proof of the variational principle are provided in Section 4, namely the Kirszbraun theorem for graphs and the concentration inequality.

3. THE LOCAL SURFACE TENSION

The purpose of this section is to show the existence of a local surface tension $\text{ent}(s)$, $s \in \mathbb{R}^m$ (see Theorem 3.1 from below). Additionally, we will also show in this section that the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s)$ is convex (see Theorem 3.2 from below). We use a similar approach as in [CKP01] in the sense that the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s)$ will be defined as limit of microscopic surface tension $\text{ent}_n(s)$ i.e.

$$\text{ent}(s) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \text{ent}_n(s).$$

Compared to [CKP01] we have to overcome new substantial technical difficulties.

Our first task is to find the right definition of the microscopic surface tension $\text{ent}_n(s)$. For example, we have to generalize the notion of periodicity from $\mathbb{Z}$ -valued height function to general graph homomorphisms. The precise definition of $\text{ent}_n(s)$ is given in Section 3.1 below.

The second difficulty is to show that the limit of the microscopic surface tensions exists, which is the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $s = (s_1, \dots, s_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $|s_1| + \dots + |s_m| < 1$ and let $\text{ent}_n(s)$ be given by Definition 3.7. Then the limit*

$$\text{ent}(s) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ent}_n(s)$$

exists and defines the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s)$.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is stated in Section 3.2. It is complex and needs some auxiliary technical preparations. Usually, in the field of discrete maps the existence of the local surface tension is shown by exact calculation using the integrability of the underlying model (cf. for example [CKP01]). We cannot use a similar procedure due to the absence of integrability in our model. In our new method, we substitute the integrability by using two ingredients:

- The first ingredient is a Kirszbaum theorem for graphs (see Theorem 4.2 from below). It states under which conditions one can attach together two different graph homomorphisms.
- The second ingredient is a concentration inequality (see Theorem 4.4 from below). It states that for canonical boundary data, a graph homomorphism cannot deviate too much from a linear height profile.

Let us illustrate with an example how those ingredients are used in the proof of Theorem 3.1. The microscopic surface tension $\text{ent}_n(s)$ is defined as a microscopic entropy with free boundary conditions. In the first step of the argument, we use the Kirszbraun theorem and the concentration inequality to show that the entropy with free boundary conditions is asymptotically close to the entropy with a well-chosen fixed free boundary condition.

Once the existence of the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s)$ is established it is quite natural to ask if the local surface tension is convex. This is the case in our model:

Theorem 3.2. *The local surface tension $\text{ent}(s)$ given by Definition 3.7 is convex in every coordinate. In particular, this implies that $\text{ent}(s)$ is convex.*

The proof of Theorem 3.2 is stated in Section 3.3. As in the proof of the existence of the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s)$, the main tools of the argument are the Kirszbraun theorem (see Theorem 4.2 from below) and the concentration inequality (see Theorem 4.4 from below).

Given that the local surface tension $\text{ent}_\ell(s)$ is convex, it is natural to ask if $\text{ent}(s)$ is also strict convex. We believe that this is the case but we are missing a proof.

3.1. Definition of the microscopic surface tension. In order to define the microscopic surface tension $\text{ent}_n(s)$ we need to study the

translation invariant measures of our model. For this purpose, we start with generalizing of the notion of periodicity of height functions to graph homomorphisms. For this purpose, we will identify the d -regular rooted tree $\mathcal{T}$ with the group

$$G = \langle \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \mid \alpha_1^2 = \dots = \alpha_d^2 = e \rangle.$$

This is done through the natural bijection induced by the Cayley graph of G generated by the α_i 's. We use the convention that the root of $\mathcal{T}$ is represented by the identity of G . The reason for this identification is that the group structure provides an easy way to define gradient measures. Using the previous bijection we can choose a canonical way to associate a unique α_i to each edge of $\mathcal{T}$. As a consequence, there is a natural way to associate to a graph homomorphism h a dual function $\tilde{h}$ acting on edges of $\mathbb{Z}^m$:

Definition 3.3 (Dual of a graph homomorphism). *Let $h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ be a graph homomorphism. We define its dual map*

$$\tilde{h} : \{e_{x,y} \mid x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^m : |x - y| = 1\} \rightarrow \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d\}$$

in the following way. Note that for any $x \sim y \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ there is a unique a_i such that $h(y) = a_i h(x)$. Then we define the value of dual function $\tilde{h}$ on the edge e_{xy} according to $\tilde{h}(e_{xy}) = a_i$.

The dual map $\tilde{h}$ determines the graph-homomorphism up to translations in the graph $\mathcal{T}$. If there is no source of confusion, we will denote the dual map and the graph homomorphism with the same symbol h .

The dual map h maps each path $p = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ in $\mathbb{Z}^m$ onto a word in the alphabet $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d\}$. We will use the notation $h(p)$ for this word.

Now, we are ready to define the analog of periodicity for graph homomorphisms.


Definition 3.4 (Translation invariant graph homomorphism). *Denote by $\vec{i}_k$ is the k -th vector of the standard basis of $\mathbb{Z}^m$ and let $h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ be a graph homomorphism. We say that h is n -translational invariant if for all $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$*

$$\tilde{h}(e_{xy}) = \tilde{h}(e_{(x+n\vec{i}_k)(y+n\vec{i}_k)}).$$

In order to define the microscopic surface tension we need to associate to every n -translation invariant homomorphism $h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ a slope, which indicates the speed at which the homomorphism travels on the graph in every direction of the plane.

Definition 3.5 (Slope of a translation invariant graph homomorphism). *Let $h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ be a n -translation invariant homomorphism. The slope*

FIGURE 4. A translation invariant configuration on a 3-regular tree. Each color of an edge represents one of the α_i 's



$s = (s_1, \dots, s_m)$ of h is defined by

$$s_k = \frac{1}{n} \min_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^m} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), h(x + n\vec{i}_k)), \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq m.$$

An essential property of n -invariant homomorphisms is that they must stay within finite distance of a unique geodesic of $\mathcal{T}$ or stay within finite distance of a single point.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ be a n -invariant homomorphism with non-null slope. Then there exist a unique geodesic $\mathbf{g} \subset \mathcal{T}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^m$*

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \mathbf{g}) \leq m \frac{n}{2}.$$

We say that $h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ is supported on the geodesic $\mathbf{g}$.

If h has null slope then h has finite range, and for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^m$

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), h(0)) \leq m \frac{n}{2}. \quad (11)$$

Proof of Lemma 3.6. We start with considering the case where the slope of h is $(0, \dots, 0)$. In this case all the points $\{h(l_1 n, \dots, l_m n)\}_{(l_1, \dots, l_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m}$ have same image and thus the range of h must be finite since every point in $\mathbb{Z}^m$ is within finite distance of one of those points. More precisely, any point $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ is within graph distance $m \frac{n}{2}$ to the set

$$\{(k_1 e_1, \dots, k_m e_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m | k_i \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

which yields the estimate (11) by the n -translational invariance of h . Let us now consider the case where the slope of h is not zero. Since G is hyperbolic, the distance between two geodesic is always infinite

and therefore $h(\mathbb{Z}^m)$ can only stay within finite distance of at most one geodesic. Let s_i be a non-zero coefficient of the slope. Due to the same reason mentioned at the beginning of this proof, the images by h of all lines parallel to e_i must stay within finite distance of a single geodesic. Moreover since all those lines are within finite distance of each other, this geodesic has to be the same for all lines because any two different geodesic in a tree diverge from each other. This means that there exist C and a geodesic $\mathbf{g}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^m : d_{\mathcal{T}}(x, \mathbf{g}) \leq m \frac{n}{2}$. $\square$

Now, we let us define the microscopic surface tension $\text{ent}_n(s)$.

Definition 3.7 (Microscopic surface tension $\text{ent}_n(s)$). *Let $\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{T}$ be an arbitrary geodesic. For $s = (s_1, \dots, s_m)$ we denote by $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$ the set*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s) := \{ & h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{T} : h \text{ is } n\text{-invariant} \\ & \text{with slope } \left(\frac{\lfloor s_1 n \rfloor}{n}, \dots, \frac{\lfloor s_m n \rfloor}{n} \right) \text{ supported on } \mathbf{g} \\ & \text{and } \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(0)) = \mathbf{g}(0) \}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Pi_{\mathbf{g}} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{g} \subset \mathcal{T}$ denotes the projection onto the geodesic $\mathbf{g}$. For $(s_1, \dots, s_m) = 0$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(0, \dots, 0) := \{ & h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{T} : h \text{ is } n\text{-invariant} \\ & \text{with slope } (0, \dots, 0) \text{ and } h(0) = \mathbf{r} \}. \end{aligned}$$

The microscopic surface tension $\text{ent}_n(s)$ is defined as

$$\text{ent}_n(s) := -\frac{1}{n^2} \ln |\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)|.$$

Because all geodesics are equivalent, the definition of $\text{ent}_n(s)$ is independent from the particular choice of $\mathbf{g}$. In particular by re-orientating the geodesic $\mathbf{g}$ we can assume wlog. that $s_1 \geq 0$.

We denote by $\mathbb{P}_n^s$ the uniform probability measure on $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$.

We want to note that the Definition 3.7 of $\text{ent}_n(s)$ is well posed i.e. the set $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$ is not empty. Indeed, one can easily construct elements of $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$ by using the Kirszbraun theorem for graphs (see Theorem 4.2 from below).

3.2. Existence of the local surface tension. The purpose of this section is to state the poof of Theorem 3.1 i.e. showing the existence of the local surface tension

$$\text{ent}(s) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ent}_n(s). \quad (12)$$

The first step towards the proof of Theorem 3.8 is the following statement, which tells us that the microscopic surface tension is not oscillating wildly.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $n_1 \leq n_2$ then*

$$|\text{ent}_{n_1}(s) - \text{ent}_{n_2}(s)| \leq C \left(1 - \left(\frac{n_1}{n_2} \right)^m + \frac{n_2 - n_1}{n_2} \right). \quad (13)$$

Proof of Lemma 3.8. Before starting the argument, let us recall the definition of $\text{ent}_n(s)$ i.e.

$$\text{ent}_n(s) := -\frac{1}{n^m} \ln \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s).$$

In the first step of the argument, we show that the size of the set $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$ is comparable to the set

$$M_n := \left\{ h \in \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s) \mid \max_{x \in S_n} |d_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{g}(\lfloor s \cdot x \rfloor), h(x))| \leq n^{0.6} \right\}.$$

Indeed, the concentration 35 inequality of Theorem 4.4 yields

$$\mathbb{P}_n^s(\max_{x \in S_n} |d_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{g}(\lfloor s \cdot x \rfloor), h(x))| \geq n^{0.6}) \leq C e^{-\frac{n^{0.2}}{12^2}}$$

This implies that for n large enough

$$\mathbb{P}_n^s(h \in M_n) \geq 1/2.$$

Because $\mathbb{P}_n^s$ is the uniform measure on $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$, this yields that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|M_n| \leq |\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)| \leq 2|M_n|.$$

For the second step of the argument, let us assume that the box S_{n_1} is centered within the box S_{n_2} (see Figure 5). We will show that

$$|M_{n_1}| \leq |M_{n_2}| \leq |M_{n_1}| d^{(n_2 - n_1)n_2^{(m-1)}}. \quad (14)$$

Indeed, the first inequality $|M_{n_1}| \leq |M_{n_2}|$ follows from the fact that any element $h \in M_{n_1}$ can be extended to a function $\bar{h} \in M_{n_2}$. The second inequality follows from the following argument. Let $\bar{h} \in M_{n_2}$. Then its restriction $\bar{h}|_{S_{n_1}}$ to the box S_{n_1} is in M_{n_1} . Additionally, we observe that there are less than $d^{n_2^{(n-m)(m-1)}}$ many ways to extend a configuration on S_{n_1} to the box S_{n_2} . This yields the desired estimate

$$|M_{n_2}| \leq |M_{n_1}| d^{(n_2 - n_1)n_2^{(m-1)}},$$

and verifies the estimate 14.

Let us now turn to the third and last step of the proof. Taking the log

of (14) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{n_1}{n_2}\right)^m \text{ent}_{n_1}(s) &= -\frac{1}{n_2^m} \ln |M_{n_1}| \\
&\geq -\frac{1}{n_2^m} \ln |M_{n_2}| \\
&\geq -\frac{1}{n_2^m} \ln |M_{n_1}| - \frac{(n_2 - n_1)n_2^{(m-1)}}{n_2^m} \ln d \\
&= \left(\frac{n_1}{n_2}\right)^m \text{ent}_{n_1}(S) - \frac{n_2 - n_1}{n_2} \ln d.
\end{aligned}$$

By observing that $-\ln d \leq \text{ent}_n(s) \leq 0$, the last estimate yields the desired inequality (13). $\square$

We want to point out that $\text{ent}_n(s)$ morally denotes a microscopic entropy with free boundary conditions. For the proof that the limit (12) exists we need that the microscopic entropy with free boundary condition and fixed boundary condition are equivalent. This is exactly the statement of the next lemma.

Theorem 3.9. *Let $\delta > 0$, S_n be a $n \times n$ square, $\mathbf{g}$ be a fixed geodesic in $\mathcal{T}$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}^M$ such that $|s|_\infty \leq 1$. Let $h_{\partial S_n} : \partial S_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ such that for all $x \in \partial S_n$ it holds*

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(h_{\partial S_n}(x), \mathbf{g}(\lfloor s \cdot x \rfloor)) \leq \delta n, \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbf{g}(\lfloor s \cdot x \rfloor) = v$ is the unique element $v \in \mathbf{g}$ with depth $|v| = \lfloor s \cdot x \rfloor$. Then it holds that

$$\text{Ent}(S_n, h_{\partial S_n}) = \text{ent}_n(s) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) + \theta(\delta),$$

where $\text{Ent}(S_n, h_{\partial S_n})$ is given by (2) and $\text{ent}_n(s)$ is the microscopic surface tension given by Definition 3.7.

Proof. In order to deduce the estimate it suffices to show that

$$\text{ent}_n(s) \leq \text{Ent}(S_n, h_{\partial S_n}) + \theta(\delta) + c \frac{\delta}{n^{m-1}} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\text{ent}_n(s_1, \dots, s_m) \geq \text{Ent}(S_n, h_{\partial S_n}) + \theta(\delta) + c \frac{\delta}{n^{m-1}}. \quad (17)$$

We start with deducing the estimate (16). By Theorem 4.4, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_{(1-2\delta)n} \left(\max_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^m} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \mathbf{g}(\lfloor s \cdot x \rfloor)) \geq \delta n \right) \leq C e^{-c\delta^2 n}, \quad (18)$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{(1-2\delta)n}$ denotes the uniform measure on $\mathcal{H}_{(1-2\delta)n}^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$. Let us define the set $\tilde{M}_{n,\varepsilon} \subset \mathcal{H}_{(1-2\delta)n}^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$ according to

$$M_{(1-2\delta)n,\delta} := \left\{ h \in \mathcal{H}_{(1-2\delta)n}^{\mathbf{g}}(s) : \max_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^m} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \mathbf{g}(\lfloor s \cdot x \rfloor)) \leq \delta n \right\}.$$

Then it follows from (18) that

$$\text{ent}_{(1-2\delta)n}(s) \geq -\frac{1}{(1-2\delta)^m n^m} \ln M_{(1-2\delta)n,\delta} + C \frac{1}{n^m}. \quad (19)$$

We observe that due to (15) and the Kirszbraun theorem (cf. Theorem 4.2) any element $h_{(1-2\delta)n} \in M_{(1-2\delta)n,\delta}$ can be extended to a graph homomorphism $h : S_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ such that $h = h_{\partial S_n}$ on ∂S_n and $h = h_{(1-2\delta)n}$ on $S_{(1-2\delta)n}$ (cf. the argument in the proof of Theorem 3.1). This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}(S_n, h_{\partial S_n}) &\leq -\frac{1}{n^m} \ln M_{(1-2\delta)n,\delta} \\ &\leq (1-2\delta)^m \text{ent}_{(1-2\delta)n}(s) + c \frac{\delta}{n^{m-1}} \\ &= \text{ent}_n(s) + \theta(\delta) + c \frac{\delta}{n^{m-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the estimate (19) from above and the identity

$$\text{ent}_{(1-2\delta)n}(s) = \text{ent}_n(s) + \theta(\delta).$$

This verifies the estimate (16).

The estimate (17) can be verified by a similar argument as was used for (16). Instead of restricting S_n to a smaller box and compare S_n with $\mathcal{H}_{(1-2\delta)n}^{\mathbf{g}}$ and $M_{(1-2\delta)n,\delta}$, one has to consider extend the box S_n and compare it with $\mathcal{H}_{(1+2\delta)n}^{\mathbf{g}}$ and $M_{(1-2\delta)n,\delta}$. We omit the details. $\square$

For the proof of Theorem 3.1 we also need the following auxiliary statement.

Lemma 3.10. *Under the same assumptions as in Lemma 3.9, let us consider the entropy $\text{Ent}(S_n, h_{\partial S_n})$. On the box S_{kn} we consider the boundary condition $h_{\partial S_{kn}}$ that arises from attaching k copies of $h_{\partial S_n}$ to each other. Then it holds that for all integers $k \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\text{Ent}(S_n, h_{\partial S_n}) \geq \text{Ent}(S_{nk}, h_{\partial S_{nk}}).$$

The proof of Lemma 3.10 follows from a simple underestimation of the configurations in $\text{Ent}(S_{nk}, h_{\partial S_{nk}})$ and is therefore omitted in this article.

Now, we have everything that is needed for the proof of Theorem 3.1.




FIGURE 5. The block S_{n_2} with the centered block S_{n_1} inside.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. The main idea is to show that the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Ent}(S_n, h_{\partial S_n}) := E(s) \quad (20)$$

also exists. Then it easily follows from statement of Theorem 3.1 that limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ent}_n(s) = E(s)$$

also exists. This would verify the statement of Theorem 3.1.

We begin with observing that

$$0 \geq e_n := \text{Ent}(S_n, h_{\partial S_n}) \geq -\ln d.$$

The reason is that edges take at most d -values. Therefore, it suffices to show that the sequence e_n cannot have two distinct accumulation points x_1 and x_2 . We argue by contradiction and assume that $-\ln d \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq 0$ are two accumulation points of the sequence e_n . Then there exists a number l such that

$$e_l \leq \frac{x_1 + x_2}{2}.$$

By Lemma, the subsequence $k \rightarrow e_{kl}$ is decreasing, hence for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$e_{kl} \leq \frac{x_1 + x_2}{2}.$$

We will now show that this implies for large enough l and k that also for all $n \geq kl$

$$e_n \leq \frac{x_1 + x_2}{2} + \varepsilon,$$

for some small constant $\varepsilon > 0$. This would be a contradiction to the assumption that x_1 and x_2 are accumulation points of the sequence e_n

and therefore would verify (20).

Hence, it is left to deduce the estimate (20). Let $n \geq mk$. Then we know that we can write

$$n = \tilde{k}l + r,$$

where $\tilde{k} \geq k$ and $0 \leq v \leq l$. By using a combination of Theorem 3.9 and Lemma 3.8, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |e_n - e_{\tilde{k}l}| &\leq |\text{ent}_{\tilde{k}l+v}(s) - e_{\tilde{k}l}| + \theta \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{k}n} \right) \\ &\leq \theta \left(\frac{1}{k} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we see that if choosing k large enough

$$e_n \leq e_{\tilde{k}l} + \varepsilon \leq \frac{x_1 + x_2}{2} + \varepsilon,$$

which verifies (20) and closes the argument. $\square$

3.3. Convexity of the local surface tension. The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 3.2, which states that the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s)$ is convex.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. The goal is to show that the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s)$ is convex in every coordinate. By symmetry it suffices to show that $\text{ent}(s)$ is convex in the first coordinate. For convenience, we only give the argument for the case $m = 2$. The argument for the general case is similar. For that reason let s_2 be fixed. We argue by contradiction. Hence, let us suppose that there are numbers $s_{1,0} < s_{1,1} < s_{1,2}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2}s_{1,0} + \frac{1}{2}s_{1,2} = s_{1,1}$$

and

$$\text{ent}(s_{1,1}, s_2) > \frac{1}{2} \text{ent}(s_{1,0}, s_2) + \frac{1}{2} \text{ent}(s_{1,2}, s_2). \quad (21)$$

For a integer n we consider the microscopic entropy $\text{ent}_n(s_{1,1}, s_2)$ given by Definition 3.7 i.e.

$$\text{ent}_n(s_{1,1}, s_2) := -\frac{1}{n^2} \ln \mathcal{H}_n^g(s_{1,1}, s_2),$$

where $\mathbf{g}$ denotes a geodesic in $\mathcal{T}$. We want to recall that elements $h \in \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s_{1,1})$ are graph homomorphisms $h : S_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$, where $S_n \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ denotes the $n \times n$ box

$$S_n := \{0, \dots, n-1\}^2.$$

We assume that without loss of generality that n is odd. The idea is to split up the box S_n into four boxes of side length $\frac{n}{2}$ i.e.

$$S_n = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3 \cup B_4.$$

Down below, we will compare the number of graph homomorphism in $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s_{1,1}, s_2)$ to the number the number of graph homomorphisms on each subbox B_i with a fixed *buckled* boundary (see Figure 6 and Figure 7). For that purpose let us take a graph homomorphism $h_b \in \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s_{1,1}, s_2)$ such that

- for all $x \in \partial S_n$ with $0 \leq x_1 \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$ and $x_2 \in \{0, \frac{n-1}{2}, n-1\}$ it holds

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}\left(h_b(x), \mathbf{g}(\lfloor s_{1,0}x_1 + s_2x_2 \rfloor)\right) \leq \delta \frac{n}{2};$$

- for all $x \in \partial S_n$ with $\frac{n}{2} \leq x_1 \leq n-1$ and $x_2 \in \{0, \frac{n-1}{2}, n-1\}$ it holds

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}\left(h_b(x), \mathbf{g}\left(\lfloor s_{1,0}\frac{n-1}{2} + s_{1,2}\left(x_1 - \frac{n-1}{2}\right) + s_2x_2 \rfloor\right)\right) \leq \delta \frac{n}{2};$$

- for all $x \in \partial S_n$ with $0 = x_1$ and $x_2 \in \{0, n-1\}$ it holds

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}\left(h_b(x), \mathbf{g}(\lfloor s_2x_2 \rfloor)\right) \leq \delta \frac{n}{2}; \text{ and}$$

- for all $x \in \partial S_n$ with $x_1 = n-1$ and $x_2 \in \{0, n-1\}$ it holds

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}\left(h_b(x), \mathbf{g}(\lfloor s_{1,1}n + s_2x_2 \rfloor)\right) \leq \delta \frac{n}{2}.$$

The role of the graph homomorphism h_b is to fix the boundary condition on each box B_i , $i = 1, \dots, 4$. Theorem 3.9 from below states that asymptotically the microscopic entropy of free and fixed boundary conditions are the same. Hence using Theorem 3.9 from below yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ent}_n(s_{1,1}, s_2) &\leq 2 \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^2 \frac{1}{n^2} \text{ent}_{\frac{n}{2}}(s_{1,0}, s_2) \\ &\quad + 2 \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^2 \frac{1}{n^2} \text{ent}_{\frac{n}{2}}(s_{1,2}, s_2) + o(\delta) + o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 6. Schematic drawing of a typical graph homomorphism $h \in \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s_1, s_2)$ on the block S_n . A blue line means that the graph homomorphism h travels with speed s_1 on $\mathbf{g}$ and a black line means that h travels with speed s_2 .




FIGURE 7. Schematic drawing of a graph homomorphism h_b . A red line means that the graph homomorphism h travels with speed $s_{1,0}$ on $\mathbf{g}$. A yellow line means that the graph homomorphism h travels with speed $s_{1,2}$. A black line means that h travels with speed s_2 .

The last estimate in combination with the fact that (cf. Theorem 3.1)

$$\text{ent}_n(s_1, s_2) = \text{ent}(s_1, s_2) + o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$$

implies that

$$\text{ent}(s_{1,1}, s_2) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ent}(s_{1,0}, s_2) + \frac{1}{2} \text{ent}(s_{1,2}, s_2) + o(\delta) + o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right),$$

which contradicts (21) and therefore closes the argument. $\square$

4. TECHNICAL OBSERVATIONS

In this section we provide the technical tools that are needed in this article to overcome the difficulty that our model is not integrable. In Section 4.1 we deduce the Kirszbraum theorem in regular trees. In Section 4.2 we deduce the concentration inequality for graph homomorphisms. The Section 5 is independent of the variational principle (cf. Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 2.9) and of its own interest. There, we show the existence of a continuum of shift-invariant ergodic gradient Gibbs measures.

4.1. A Kirszbraum theorem for graph homomorphisms. For continuous metrics, Kirszbraum theorems state that under the right conditions a k -Lipschitz function defined on a subset of a metric space can be extended to the whole space (cf. [Kir34, Val43, Sch69]). The goal of this section is to show that such theorems also exist for various spaces of discrete functions, among them being the graph homomorphisms from $\mathbb{Z}^m$ to a d -regular tree.

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a d -regular rooted tree with $d \geq 2$. For this subsection we will define w_0 to be a fixed point of $\mathcal{T}$ far away from the root that is several time the diameter of the finite regions we consider. We denote by

$$|w| := d_{\mathcal{T}}(w, w_0) \quad (22)$$

i.e. the graph distance from w to w_0 , which we will also call depth. Since $\mathbb{Z}^m$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are both bipartite, we can fix a 2-coloring of the two graphs and we call parity the color of a vertex.

We start by proving a lemma which states that, using the tree structure, once the image of a single point is fixed it is always possible to build a graph homomorphism that goes as fast as possible in one direction of the tree (here towards w_0).

Lemma 4.1. *Let Λ be a connected region of $\mathbb{Z}^m$, x be a point in Λ , w be a vertex of $\mathcal{T}$ and $p = \{w = v_0, \dots, w_0 = v_k\}$ be the geodesic path in $\mathcal{T}$ going from w to w_0 . The map $h_x^w : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ by $h_x^w(y) = v_{d(x,y)}$ is a graph homomorphism.*

Proof. The function h_x^w is 1-Lipschitz since the graph distance is 1-Lipschitz. Moreover two neighbors cannot have the same image because for bipartite graphs, the parity of the graph distance to a single point depends on the parity of the vertex. Therefore h_x^w is a graph homomorphism. $\square$

We are now able to prove the Kirzbraun theorem.

Theorem 4.2 (Kirzbraun theorem for graphs). *Let Λ be a connected region of $\mathbb{Z}^m$, S be a subset of Λ and $\bar{h} : S \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ be a graph homomorphism which conserves the parity. There exist a graph homomorphism $h : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ such that $h = \bar{h}$ on S if and only if for all x, y in S :*

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x), \bar{h}(y)) \leq |x - y|_{l_1} \quad (23)$$

Remark 4.3. *In this remark we want to point out why we need the parity condition in Theorem 4.2. Let us for example consider a situation where*

$$|x - y|_{l_1} = 2$$

and

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x), \bar{h}(y)) = 1.$$

Then it follows that the condition (23) is satisfied but there cannot be an extension h of $\bar{h}$. However, the graph homomorphism $\bar{h}$ in this example is violating the parity condition.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. The condition (23) is clearly necessary since a graph homomorphism is 1-Lipschitz. Suppose now that (23) holds, and consider:

$$h(y) = \operatorname{argmax}\{|h_x^{\bar{h}(x)}(y)|, x \in S\}, \quad (24)$$

where $|h_x^{\bar{h}(x)}(y)| = \operatorname{dist}_{\mathcal{T}}(h_x^{\bar{h}(x)}(y), w_0)$ (cf. (22)). In other words, $h(y)$ is the only $h_x^{\bar{h}(x)}(y)$ which maximize the distance to w_0 for x in S .

In order to prove Theorem 4.2, we only need to show that h is well defined, that $h = \bar{h}$ on S and that h is a graph homomorphism.

We begin with proving that h is well defined. We will show that if exist $y \in \Lambda$ and $x_1, x_2 \in S$ such that $|h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(y)| = |h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y)|$, then it holds that

$$h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(y) = h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y) \quad (25)$$

Indeed, since by definition

$$d_{\mathbb{Z}^m}(x_i, y) = d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_i), h_{x_i}^{\bar{h}(x_i)}(y)),$$

the subadditivity of the graph distance and (23) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_1), \bar{h}(x_2)) &\leq d_{\mathbb{Z}^m}(x_1, x_2) \\ &\leq d_{\mathbb{Z}^m}(x_1, y) + d_{\mathbb{Z}^m}(y, x_2) \\ &\leq d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_1), h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(y)) + d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_2), h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y)). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Now let $v \in \mathcal{T}$ be the unique vertex on the geodesic path between $\bar{h}(x_1)$ and w_0 such that

$$d_{\mathbb{Z}^m}(\bar{h}(x_1), \bar{h}(x_2)) = d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_1), v) + d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_2), v). \quad (27)$$

Due to the tree structure, all the vertices w on one geodesic path between $\{\bar{h}(x_i)\}_{i=1,2}$ and w_0 and such that $d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_i), v) \leq d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_i), w)$ must also be on the other geodesic path. Combining (26) and (27) gives

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_1), v) + d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_2), v) \leq d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_1), h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(y)) + d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_2), h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y)).$$

Thus either

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_1), v) \leq d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_1), h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(y))$$

or

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_2), v) \leq d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_2), h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y)).$$

Hence at least one of the $h_{x_i}^{\bar{h}(x_i)}(y)$ is on both geodesic paths. Since the depth is one-to-one on those paths, the only way that $|h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(y)| = |h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y)|$ is if $h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(y) = h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y)$ which concludes the first part of the proof.

We prove now that $h = \bar{h}$ on S . For any pair of points $x_1, x_2 \in S$, we know from the definition of the map $h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}$ that

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_2), h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(x_1)) = d_{\mathbb{Z}^m}(x_2, x_1).$$

Thus it follows from the definition of $|w| = \text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}}(w, w_0)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(x_1)| &= |h(\bar{x}_2)| - d_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{h}(x_2), h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y)) \\ &= |h(\bar{x}_2)| - d_{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, x_2) \\ &\leq |h(\bar{x}_2)| - (|h(\bar{x}_1)| - |h(\bar{x}_2)|) \\ &\leq |h(\bar{x}_1)|. \end{aligned}$$

This means that, at the point x_1 , the maximum argument in (24) must be reached for x_1 and thus $h(x_1) = \bar{h}(x_1)$.

Now, we will show that h is a graph homomorphism. For this purpose let $y \sim z \in \Lambda$ be nearest neighbors. We have to show that this implies $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}}(h(y), h(z)) = 1$. We distinguish two cases. In the first case we assume that there is $x \in S$ such that

$$h(y) = h_x^{\bar{h}(x)}(y) \quad \text{and} \quad h(z) = h_x^{\bar{h}(x)}(z).$$

In this case, the fact that $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}}(h(y), h(z)) = 1$ directly follows from Lemma 4.1 which states that all the $h_x^{\bar{h}(x)}$ are graph homomorphisms

themselves.

Let us now consider the second case where we assume that there exist $x_1, x_2 \in S$, $x_1 \neq x_2$ such that

$$h(y) = h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(y) \quad \text{and} \quad h(z) = h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(z).$$

Then, we have to show that

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{T}} \left(h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(y), h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(z) \right) = 1.$$

In this situation we will show below that either

$$h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(y) = h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y). \quad (32)$$

or

$$h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(z) = h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(z). \quad (33)$$

Indeed, if this statement is true we have reduced the second case to the first case.

Let us now deduce the statement (32) and (33). By the definition of the map h it must hold that

$$\left| |h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(z)| - |h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y)| \right| \leq 2,$$

else one could easily construct a contradiction. The case

$$\left| |h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(z)| - |h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y)| \right|$$

cannot happen. Else one would get a contradiction to the fact that $\bar{h}$ conserves the parity. Hence it follows that

$$|h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(z)| = |h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y)| \pm 1.$$

Hence we have that either

$$|h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(z)| = |h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(z)|$$

or

$$|h_{x_1}^{\bar{h}(x_1)}(y)| = |h_{x_2}^{\bar{h}(x_2)}(y)|.$$

Now, we are in the same situation as in the second step and can conclude from (25) that either (32) or (33) must be satisfied, which concludes the argument. $\square$

4.2. Concentration results. The main purpose of this section is to deduce a concentration inequality for the uniform measure on the set $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$, which is defined in Definition 3.7. The concentration inequality is:

Theorem 4.4 (Concentration inequality). *There exist a universal constant C such that, under the uniform measure on $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$, for all $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ in $\mathbb{Z}^m$, and for all $\varepsilon \geq n^{-0.45}$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}_n^s(\max_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^m} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \mathbf{g}(\lfloor s \cdot x \rfloor)) \geq \varepsilon n) \leq Ce^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{10^2}}, \quad (34)$$

where we used the definition that $\mathbf{g}(k)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, denotes the unique point on $\mathbf{g}$ with depth k (cf. (22)).

As simple consequence of the translational invariance is that also

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{x \in S_n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \mathbf{g}(s \cdot x)) \geq \varepsilon n\right) \leq Ce^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{2 \cdot 10^2}}. \quad (35)$$

We will deduce Theorem 4.4 from an auxiliary concentration inequality. In order to formulate this inequality (see Lemma 4.6 from below), let us introduce the natural analogue of the norm of $|\cdot|$ on a tree, which we call *depth*.

Definition 4.5 (Depth on a tree). *Let $\mathbf{g}$ be a geodesic of $\mathcal{T}$ and let $\pm\infty_{\mathbf{g}}$ denote the boundary point of the geodesic $\mathbf{g}$. The depth associated to the geodesic $\mathbf{g}$ is given by the unique function $|\cdot| : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $|\mathbf{r}| = 0$ and for nearest neighbors $v \sim w \in \mathcal{T}$*

$$|v| = |w| + \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } v \text{ is closer to } \infty_{\mathbf{g}} \text{ than } w, \\ 1, & \text{if } v \text{ is closer to } -\infty_{\mathbf{g}} \text{ than } w. \end{cases}$$

We want to note that the depth can be negative. On the set $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$ we always consider the depth associated with the geodesic $\mathbf{g}$.

As we will see below, the statement of Theorem 4.4 follows from the following auxiliary concentration estimate.

Lemma 4.6 (Auxiliary concentration inequality). *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ it holds*

$$\mathbb{P}_n^s(|h(x)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(x)|] \geq \varepsilon n) \leq Ce^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{32}}.$$

The proof of Lemma 4.6 is in several steps. Following inspiration from [CEP96], the argument uses the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (see Lemma 4.7 from below). Because we are considering graph homomorphisms to a tree, verifying the assumptions of the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality is very challenging. For this purpose we developed a completely new argument based on a subtle coupling method. We state

the proof of Lemma 4.6 with all the details in Section 4.2.1 and now continue to state the proof of Theorem 4.4. The only additional ingredient that is needed in the proof of Theorem 4.4 is the fact that every element $h \in \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$ has to stay close to the geodesic $\mathbf{g}$ (see Lemma 3.6).

Proof of Theorem 4.4. The goal is to derive the estimate (34), which is verified in several steps. Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$. The auxiliary concentration inequality of Lemma 4.6 states that

$$\mathbb{P}(|h(x)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(x)|]| \geq \epsilon n) \leq C e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2 n}{32}}, \quad (36)$$

where we used the simplified notation $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_n^s$. We argue that a combination of the estimate (36) and the fact that $h \in \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ is n -translational invariant yields that

$$\mathbb{P}(\max_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^m} ||h(x)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(x)|]| \geq \epsilon n) \leq C e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2 n}{64}}. \quad (37)$$

Indeed, due to the fact that h is n -translational invariant it holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\max_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^m} ||h(x)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(x)|]| \geq \epsilon n) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\max_{x \in [0, n]^m} ||h(x)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(x)|]| \geq \epsilon n) \\ &\leq \sum_{x \in [0, n]^m} \mathbb{P}(|h(x)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(x)|]| \geq \epsilon n) \\ &\leq C n^m e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2 n}{32}} \\ &\leq C e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2 n}{64}}, \end{aligned}$$

which verifies the estimate (37).

In the next step, we show that the estimate (37) yields

$$\mathbb{P}(d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))) \geq \epsilon n) \leq C e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2 n}{64}}, \quad (38)$$

where $\Pi_{\mathbf{g}} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{g}$ denotes the projection onto the nearest point in $\mathbf{g}$. We start with arguing that the function $k \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[|h(k, 0, \dots, 0)|]$ is non-decreasing. Since wlog. the slope is non-negative we know that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[|h(k, 0, \dots, 0)|] \geq 0$. Moreover

$$\mathbb{E}[|h(k, 0, \dots, 0)|] = \sum_{0 \leq i < k} \mathbb{E}[|h(i+1, 0, \dots, 0)|] - \mathbb{E}[|h(i, 0, \dots, 0)|],$$

we can deduce from the translation invariance that $\mathbb{E}[|h(i+1, 0, \dots, 0)|] - \mathbb{E}[|h(i, 0, \dots, 0)|] \geq 0$ and therefore the function $k \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[|h(k, 0, \dots, 0)|]$ must be non-decreasing, which yields that for $l \geq k$:

$$\mathbb{E}[|h(l, 0, \dots, 0)|] - \mathbb{E}[|h(k, 0, \dots, 0)|] \leq 0. \quad (39)$$

Now, let k be such that $d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(k, 0, \dots, 0), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(k, 0, \dots, 0))) \geq c$. Since all configurations are supported on the geodesic $\mathbf{g}$, we know there exist $l > k$ such that: $|h(l, \dots, 0)| \leq |h(k, \dots, 0)| - c$. Hence, by using the estimate (39) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} c &\leq |h(k, \dots, 0)| - |h(l, \dots, 0)| \\ &= |h(k, \dots, 0)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(k, 0, \dots, 0)|] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[|h(k, 0, \dots, 0)|] - \mathbb{E}[|h(l, 0, \dots, 0)|] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[|h(l, 0, \dots, 0)|] - |h(l, \dots, 0)| \\ &\leq ||h(k, \dots, 0)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(k, 0, \dots, 0)|]| \\ &\quad + ||h(l, \dots, 0)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(l, 0, \dots, 0)|]|. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that either

$$||h(l, 0, \dots, 0)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(l, 0, \dots, 0)|]| \geq c/2$$

or

$$||h(k, 0, \dots, 0)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(k, 0, \dots, 0)|]| \geq c/2.$$

Combining this with the estimate (37) yields the desired estimate (38).

We observe that the concentration inequality (38) together with the universal bound, due to Lemma 3.6, that

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))) \leq m \frac{n}{2}$$

yields that

$$\mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x)))] \leq Cn^{0.51}. \quad (40)$$

Finally, let us now deduce the desired estimate (34). The translation invariance yields that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))|] = s \cdot x.$$

Without loss of generality we assume that $0 \leq s \cdot x \in \mathbb{Z}$. We recall that $\mathbf{g}(s \cdot x)$ denotes the unique point $u \in \mathbf{g}$ on the geodesic $\mathbf{g} \subset \mathcal{T}$

such that $|u| = s \cdot x$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{\mathcal{T}}(\Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x)), \mathbf{g}(s \cdot x)) &= ||\Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))| - \mathbb{E}[|\Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))|]| \\
&\leq |d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))) + |\Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))| \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x)))] - \mathbb{E}[|\Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))|]| \\
&\quad + |d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))) - \mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x)))]| \\
&= ||h(x)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(x)|]| + |d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))) - \mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x)))]|,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that

$$|h(x)| = d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))) + |\Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))|$$

and also that

$$\mathbb{E}[|h(x)|] = \mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x)))] + \mathbb{E}[|\Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))|].$$

Overall, using now the bound (40) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{\mathcal{T}}(\Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x)), \mathbf{g}(s \cdot x)) &\leq ||h(x)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(x)|]| + d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))) + Cn^{0.51}.
\end{aligned}$$

We observe that due to the fact that $\varepsilon \geq n^{-0.45}$ it holds that for large enough n :

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{2}n - Cn^{0.51} \geq \frac{n^{0.55}}{2} - cn^{0.51} \geq 0.$$

Hence, if we assume that

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(\Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x)), \mathbf{g}(s \cdot x)) \geq \varepsilon n,$$

it follows that

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{2}n \leq ||h(x)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(x)|]| + d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))).$$

The last estimate yields that either

$$||h(x)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(x)|]| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}n$$

or

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}n.$$

Hence, we get from the concentration inequality (36) and (38) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \mathbf{g}(s \cdot x)) \geq \varepsilon n) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}\left(d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}(h(x))) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}n\right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P}\left(|h(x)| - \mathbb{E}[|h(x)|] \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}n\right) \\
& \leq 2Ce^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{2^{10}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

which is the desired estimate (34).

The estimate (35) follows easily from the observation that by the translational invariance of h

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{x \in S_n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \mathbf{g}(s \cdot x)) \geq \varepsilon n\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{x \in S_n} \mathbb{P}(d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \mathbf{g}(s \cdot x)) \geq \varepsilon n) \\
& \leq n^m 2Ce^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{2^{10}}} \\
& \leq Ce^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{2^{12}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.2.1. *Proof of Lemma 4.6.* We will derive the statement of Lemma 4.6 from the well-known Azuma-Hoeffding inequality.

Lemma 4.7 (Azuma-Hoeffding [Azu67, Hoe63]). *Suppose that $(X_k)_{\mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale and*

$$|X_k - X_{k-1}| < c_k \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

Then for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_N - X_0| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2 \sum_{k=1}^N c_k^2}\right).$$

In order to apply Azuma-Hoeffding we have to specify which martingale X_k we are considering. For this let us first introduce a filtration of sigma algebras $\mathcal{F}_k$ we are using. We consider a path $p : \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^m$ from $0 \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ to $x \in S_n$ i.e. $p(0) = 0$ and $p(|x|_{\mathcal{I}}) = x$. We define the functions $g_k : \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}$ for $k = 0$ via

$$g_0(h) = |h(p(0))|$$

and for $k \geq 1$ via

$$g_k(h) = |h(p(k))| - |h(p(k-1))|.$$

Then, the sigma algebras $\mathcal{F}_k$ are define via

$$\mathcal{F}_k = \sigma(g_l, 0 \leq l \leq k).$$

Now, we define the martingale X_k , $0 \leq k \leq |x|_{l^1}$ in the usual way using conditional expectations i.e.

$$X_k = \mathbb{E} [|h(x)| | \mathcal{F}_k],$$

where $\mathbb{E}$ denotes the expectation under the uniform probability measure on $\mathcal{H}_n^g(s_1, \dots, s_n)$. We note that for $k = |x|_{l^1}$ it holds

$$X_{|x|_{l^1}} = |h(x)|.$$

As a consequence, the statement of Lemma 4.6 follows directly from Azuma-Hoeffding by choosing $N = |x|_{l^1}$ (see Lemma 4.7), if we can show that almost surely

$$|X_k - X_{k-1}| \leq 4.$$

This is exactly the statement of the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Using the definitions from above, it holds for $k = 1 \dots, |x|_{l^1}$ that*

$$|X_k - X_{k-1}| = |\mathbb{E} [|h(x)| | \mathcal{F}_k] - \mathbb{E} [|h(x)| | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}]| \leq 4. \quad (41)$$

Hence, we see that in order to deduce Lemma 4.6 it is only left to verify Lemma 4.8. For deducing the estimate 41, we need to show that changing the depth of a single point y does not influence too much the expected depth of the point x . The proof of Lemma 4.8 is quite subtle. The reason being that the structure of the uniform probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ on the set $\mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$ is extremely hard to break down. Unfortunately, without classical tools related to the integrability of the model (see for example [CEP96]) it seems that there is no direct way to compare $\mathbb{E}_n^s[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{k+1}]$ and $\mathbb{E}_n^s[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_k]$.

Instead, we use a dynamic approach. We construct a coupled Markov chain (X_n, Y_n) on $\mathcal{H}_n^g(s)^2$ such that the law of X_n converges to $\mathbb{E}_n^s[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{k+1}]$ and the law of Y_n converges to $\mathbb{E}_n^s[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_k]$. The crucial property will be that the Markov chain keeps the depth deviation of X_n and Y_n invariant. This means that if $|X_n(x)| - |Y_n(x)| \leq c$ then also $|X_n(x)| - |Y_n(x)| \leq c$. Because this property is verified at each step and the law of the Markov chain converges to $\mathbb{E}_n^s[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{k+1}]$ and $\mathbb{E}_n^s[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_k]$, it also holds that

$$|\mathbb{E}_n^s [|h(x)| | \mathcal{F}_{k+1}] - \mathbb{E}_n^s [|h(x)| | \mathcal{F}_k]| \leq c,$$

which is the desired statement of Lemma 4.8.

There is a natural choice for this Markov chain sampling the uniform measure on $\mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$, namely the Glauber dynamic (see Definition 4.12). Unfortunately, even when coupled, the Glauber dynamic does not conserve the depth deviation. This can be seen by constructing counter examples involving fake minima (cf. Definition 4.9 and the proof of Lemma 4.8 from below). If one would consider graph homomorphisms to $\mathbb{Z}$ then this technical problem would not appear and one could use the classical Glauber dynamic.

We overcome this technical difficulty in the following way: We carefully analyze the situations in which the depth deviation can increase under the Glauber dynamic. By adding a resampling step before every Glauber step, we can prevent that those situations appear. When adding the resampling step to the Glauber dynamic one has to be very careful not to introduce a bias. We will show that this modified Glauber dynamic still converges to the uniform measure on $\mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$ given $\mathcal{F}_k$ and $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$.

We begin with introducing some necessary definitions.

Definition 4.9 (Minimum and extremum of a graph-homomorphism). *Let $h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ be a graph-homomorphism. We say that a point $x \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ is minimum for h if*

$$|h(x)| < |h(z)| \quad \text{for all } z \sim x.$$

If additionally

$$h(z) = h(\tilde{z}) \quad \text{for all } z, \tilde{z} \sim x$$

we say that x is a true minimum, otherwise we say that x is a fake minimum for h . Finally, if

$$h(z) = h(\tilde{z}) \quad \text{for all } z, \tilde{z} \sim x$$

holds without the first condition we say that x is an extremum of h

For an illustration of Definition 4.9 we refer to Figure 8.

Remark 4.10. *One could imagine is that x is a fake local maximum for X_n and a true local maximum for Y_n . But there are no fake local maximum for the depth since, for a given point, there is only one neighbor with lower depth.*

Definition 4.11. (Pivoting) *If x is an extrema of h , we call pivoting x the following operation:*

- *For $z \sim x$, choose w randomly and with equal probability among the neighbors of $h(z)$.*





FIGURE 8. Extremum of a graph homomorphism


 FIGURE 9. Example of pivoting the extremum x of a graph homomorphism

- Set $h(x) = w$.

In Figure 9 we illustrate what pivoting means for a graph homomorphism to a tree. With the notion of pivoting, we can define the natural Glauber dynamic on $\mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$.

Definition 4.12. (*Glauber dynamic*) The following Markov chain on $\mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$ is called Glauber dynamic. Let $X_n \in \mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$, then X_{n+1} is attained via the following procedure:

- (1) Choose a vertex $x \in S_n \subset \mathbb{Z}^m$ uniformly at random.
- (2) If $X_n(x)$ is an extremum in the sense of Definition 4.9 then pivot X_n around x . Else do nothing.

In order to define this dynamic, we must first introduce the concepts of excursion and edge resampling.

Definition 4.13 (Excursion). Let $h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ be a translation invariant homomorphism and $\mathcal{T}_0$ be a complete branch of $\mathcal{T}$ such that the vertex of $\mathcal{T}_0$ with lowest depth has degree one. We say that an excursion of h is a connected component $\mathcal{C}$ of $h^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_0)$ on which the depth is bounded from above (see Figure 10).

Definition 4.14 (Excursion resampling). *Let $h : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ be a graph homomorphism and $\mathcal{C}$ be an excursion of h . We call the following operation resampling the excursion $\mathcal{C}$:*

- (1) *Choose $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ randomly with equal probability.*
- (2) *For all edges e_{xy} on the outer boundary of $\mathcal{C}$ we set $h(e_{xy}) = \alpha_i$.*

If the edge e_{xy} is on the outer boundary of an excursion of h , we will say that e_{xy} is resampleable for h . See also Figure 11 and Figure 12 for an illustration.

FIGURE 10. Illustration of an excursion (see Definition 4.13). The edges in red are on the outer boundary of the excursion






FIGURE 11. Excursion before resampling



As we mentioned above the depth deviation can increase in the original Glauber dynamic. This can always happen, if one configuration has a

FIGURE 12. Excursion after resampling



fake minimum and the other configuration does not. For our adapted Glauber dynamic it is important to decide if an edge e_{xy} of a fake minimum at x is resampleable or not. The notion of an excursion helps a lot in that task, as we see in the next lemma.

Lemma 4.15. *Let $x \in \Lambda$ be a fake minimum for the homomorphism h and let e_{xy} be an edge starting from x . The edge e_{xy} is not resampleable for h if and only if there exist an infinite path $p = \{x_0 = x, x_1 = y, \dots\}$ and such that:*

- (1) For all $i \geq 1 : |h(x_i)| > |h(x)|$
- (2) $\sup_{i \geq 1} |h(x_i)| = \infty$

Moreover, two resampleable edges e_{xy} and $e_{x'y'}$ are in a common excursion if there exist a path $p = \{x_0 = x, \dots, x_n = x\}$ whose first and last edges are e_{xy} and $e_{y'x'}$ and such that for all $1 < i < n : |h(x_i)| > |h(x)|$.

Proof. Suppose that e_{xy} is not in an excursion, and consider the connected component $\mathcal{C}$ of $h^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_0)$ which contains y where $\mathcal{T}_0$ is the complete tree with root $h(y)$. By definition e_{xy} is not in an excursion if and only the depth is not bounded from above on $\mathcal{C}$. Consider a sequence $\{x_1, \dots, x_n, \dots\}$ in $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that for all $i \geq \mathbb{N} : |h(x_i)| = |h(x) + 1|$, and build a path p that goes through all the x_i 's while staying in $\mathcal{C}$ (this is always possible since $\mathcal{C}$ is connected), then p verifies the conditions of the lemma. Reciprocally, if e_{xy} is resampleable for h then the depth is bounded from above on $\mathcal{C}$ and any path p on which the depth is not bounded from above must leave $\mathcal{C}$ at some point. $\square$

We want to apply the resampling-step in combination with the original Glauber dynamic to sample the uniform measure in $\mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$ conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_k$. Hence, as a first step it is important to show that re-sampling

step maps an element from $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$ onto an element in $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$. More precisely, we show in the next lemma that the set $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$ is invariant under re-sampling.

Lemma 4.16. *Resampling preserves n -translation invariance. That is, if e_{xy} and $e_{x'y'}$ are on the border of a common excursion if and only if the edges $e_{(x+n\vec{i}_k)(y+n\vec{i}_k)}$ and $e_{(x'+n\vec{i}_k)(y'+n\vec{i}_k)}$ are also on the border of a common excursion for $1 \leq k \leq m$.*

Proof. In order to prove this lemma, we need to show that:

- (1) An edge e_{xy} is an excursion if and only if the edge $e_{x+n\vec{i}_k y+n\vec{i}_k}$ is also in an excursion for $1 \leq k \leq m$.
- (2) Two edges e_{xy} and $e_{x'y'}$ are on the border of the same excursion if and only if $e_{(x+n\vec{i}_k)(y+n\vec{i}_k)}$ and $e_{(x'+n\vec{i}_k)(y'+n\vec{i}_k)}$ are on the border of the same excursion

Both claims follow from the fact that translating by $n\vec{i}_k$ leaves the depth difference invariant since the geodesic $\mathbf{g}$ which support the configuration is left unchanged by translation.

Hence, if there exist an infinite path $p = \{x_0 = x, x_1 = y, \dots\}$ such that for all $i \geq 1 : |h(x_i)| > |h(x)|$ and $\sup_{i \geq 1} |h(x_i)| = \infty$. Then the path $p + n\vec{i}_k = \{x_0 = x + n\vec{i}_k, x_1 = y + n\vec{i}_k, \dots\}$ also verifies for all $i \geq 1 : |h(x_i)| > |h(x)|$ and $\sup_{i \geq 1} |h(x_i)| = \infty$

Similarly two edges e_{xy} and $e_{x'y'}$ are on the border of a common excursion if there exist a path $p = \{x_0 = x, x_1 = y, \dots, x_{n-1} = y', x_n = x\}$ such that for all $1 < i < n : |h(x_i)| > |h(x)|$ which is true if and only if the path $p + n\vec{i}_k = \{x_0 = x + n\vec{i}_k, x_1 = y + n\vec{i}_k, \dots, x_{n-1} = y' + n\vec{i}_k, x_n = x + n\vec{i}_k\}$ also verifies for all $1 < i < n : |h(x_i + n\vec{i}_k)| > |h(x + n\vec{i}_k)|$. $\square$

We now are able to describe the adapted Glauber dynamic that is used in the proof of Lemma 4.8.

Definition 4.17 (Adapted Glauber dynamic). *Let $(c_1, \dots, c_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ and denote by $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)[c_1, \dots, c_k]$ to be the set of homomorphisms $h \in \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)$ such that $|h(x_i)| - |h(0)| = c_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. We consider the following dynamic:*

- (1) Choose a vertex $x \in S_n$.
- (2) If $|h(x)| - |h(0)|$ is not fixed then: Resample randomly the edges around x which are resampleable for h . If x becomes an extremum, pivot x after that and resample randomly again the edges around x .
- (3) If $|h(x)| - |h(0)|$ is fixed (through $\mathcal{F}_k$) then only resample randomly the edges around x but do not pivot x .

In the next lemma, we show that the adapted Glauber dynamic converges to the correct law.

Lemma 4.18. *If $s \cdot x < 1$, the Markov chain $\{M_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ given by Definition 4.17 is reversible and irreducible on the state space $\mathcal{H}_n^g(s)[c_1, \dots, c_k]$. As a direct consequence, the law of $\{M_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to the uniform measure on $\mathcal{H}_n^g(s)[c_1, \dots, c_k]$.*

Proof. First, we observe that this dynamic leaves $\mathcal{H}_n^g(s)[c_1, \dots, c_k]$ invariant since resampling an edge does not change the depth and the dynamic only pivot vertices whose depth is not fixed.

We prove now that the chain is irreducible. Let $h \in \mathcal{H}_n^g(s)[c_1, \dots, c_k]$ and let e_{xy} be an edge such that $h(x) \in \mathbf{g}$ but $h(y) \notin \mathbf{g}$. Since h stays within finite distance of $\mathbf{g}$, $h(y)$ must be in an excursion of h and e_{xy} is resamplable for h . Moreover, with positive probability, $h(y)$ will be on $\mathbf{g}$ after resampling e_{xy} . Since there is a positive probability that step 2 and 3 of the dynamic leave h invariant, we can apply this operation a finite number of times in order to get a configuration which is entirely supported on $\mathbf{g}$ with positive probability. Hence it is sufficient to consider the set of homomorphisms which are fully supported on the geodesic $\mathbf{g}$ and show that this set is irreducible for this dynamic. From now on we will consider that all excursion resampling leave the graph homomorphism invariant and that all pivoting moves do not move away from $\mathbf{g}$ (this always happen with positive probability). Define the distance between two homomorphisms h and h' supported on $\mathbf{g}$ by

$$d(h, h') = \sum_{x \in S_n} ||h(x)| - |h'(x)||.$$

It is clear that $d(h, h') = 0$ implies h equal h' and that $d(h, h') = 0$ must be finite since S_n is finite. Hence if we show that there exist always a pivot move which decrease the distance between two configurations, we can use inductive argument to prove that the Chain is irreducible. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the cluster on which $||h(x)| - |h'(x)||$ is maximal and let x_0 be a point in $\mathcal{C}$. Suppose without restriction that h is greater than h' on $\mathcal{C}$ and define $p = \{x_0, \dots, x_q\}$ to be a maximal increasing path starting from x_0 . That is a path of maximal length such that for all $0 \leq i < q : h(x_{i+1}) = h(x_i)$. This path has to be finite otherwise there exist two points x_i and x_j along the path p which are n -translate of each other and the slope verifies $s \cdot x = 1$. All points on the path have to be in $\mathcal{C}$ since for all $0 \leq i < q$:

$$h'(x_{i+1}) - h'(x_i) \leq h(x_{i+1}) - h(x_i)$$

Moreover, the fact that p is of maximal length impose that $h(x_q)$ is a local maximum for the depth. Hence it is possible to do a pivoting move

at x_q which decrease the depth of x_q by 2 and decrease the distance between h and h' .

We now show that the Markov chain is reversible on $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)[c_1, \dots, c_k]$. Consider two homomorphisms h and h' such that

$$p(h, h') = \mathbb{E}[M_{n+1} = h' | M_n = h] > 0.$$

This means that it is possible to apply the dynamic at a single point x to go from h to h' . We notice that both the law of edge resampling and pivoting are uniform over the spaces of reachable configurations. Thus all operations are reversible which gives immediately that $p(h, h') = p(h', h)$ and the chain is reversible.

Because the Markov chain has a finite state space and is reversible, it follows from standard theory of Markov processes that the law of the chain converges to the unique invariant probability measure (see for example [Dur10]). $\square$

Now, we are ready to state the proof of Lemma 4.8.

Proof of Lemma 4.8. We consider a Markov chain X_l on the state space

$$\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)[c_1, \dots, c_{k+1}]$$

given by the adapted Glauber dynamic of Definition 4.17. Let Y_l denote the Markov chain on the state space $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)[c_1, \dots, c_k]$ that is also given by the adapted Glauber dynamic of Definition 4.17. As outlined before, the strategy is to define a coupling (X_l, Y_l) of those Markov chains such that

$$\max_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^m} ||X_l(y)| - |Y_l(y)|| \leq 2 \Rightarrow \max_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^m} ||X_{l+1}(y)| - |Y_{l+1}(y)|| \leq 2 \quad (42)$$

We postpone the verification of (42) and show how it is used to derive the statement of Lemma 4.8. We pick $h \in \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)[c_1, \dots, c_{k+1}]$ arbitrary and set $X_0 = h$. Then by the Kirszbraun theorem (cf. Theorem 4.2) there exists an element $\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(s)[c_1, \dots, c_k]$ such that

$$\max_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^m} \left| |h(y)| - |\tilde{h}(y)| \right| \leq 2.$$

Hence, we set $Y_0 = \tilde{h}$ and we get from (42) that for any realization of the Markov chain and all $l \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\max_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^m} ||X_l(y)| - |Y_l(y)|| \leq 2.$$

The last estimate implies

$$|\mathbb{E}[|X_l(x)|] - \mathbb{E}[|Y_l(x)|]| \leq |\mathbb{E}[|X_l(x)|] - \mathbb{E}[|Y_l(x)|]| \leq 2.$$

Now, Lemma 4.7 yields that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[|X_l(x)|] = \mathbb{E}_n^s[|h(x)| \mid \mathcal{F}_{k+1}]$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[|Y_l(x)|] = \mathbb{E}_n^{ssd}[|h(x)| \mid \mathcal{F}_k].$$

Hence, we overall get the desired estimate (41)

$$|\mathbb{E}_n^{(s_1, \dots, s_m)}[|h(x)| \mid \mathcal{F}_{k+1}] - \mathbb{E}_n^{(s_1, \dots, s_m)}[|h(x)| \mid \mathcal{F}_k]| \leq 2.$$

The only thing left to show is that such a coupling (X_n, Y_n) indeed exists. Let us consider an element $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that

$$|X_n(y)| = |Y_n(y)|.$$

Then every coupling of the chain X_n and Y_n works because the adapted Glauber dynamic can only increase the depth deviation in one time step by 2.

Therefore, let us now consider an element $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that

$$||X_n(y)| - |Y_n(y)|| = 2.$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that (else we just interchange the role of X_n and Y_n in the argument)

$$|X_n(y)| \geq |Y_n(y)| + 2.$$

In this situation, there is only one scenario in which the original Glauber dynamic would increase the depth deviation to 4, more precisely, such that

$$||X_{n+1}(y)| - |Y_{n+1}(y)|| = 4.$$

The scenario is when x is a true local minimum for X_n and a fake local minimum for Y_n (recall that fake local maxima cannot exist for tree-valued height functions, cf. Remark 4.10). The depth deviation could now increase if the Glauber dynamic selects the site x . Then the Glauber dynamic could pivot $X_n(x)$ but not $Y_n(x)$, which could possibly increase the depth deviation to 4. However, by our additional resampling step we now show that there is a coupling that prevents this scenario from happening.

Let us explain this strategy in more details. First of all, we want to mention that edge-resampling does not change the depth of a configuration. Hence, the additional resampling steps of our adapted Glauber

dynamic compared to the original Glauber dynamic cannot create a violation of the desired conclusion (42). Down below, we construct a coupling such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\{y \text{ is a true local minima of } L_y X_l\} \\ &\Rightarrow \{y \text{ is a true local minimum of } L_y Y_l\}, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where $L_y X_l \in \mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$ and $L_y Y_l \in \mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$ denote the states obtained after resampling the edges of h and $\tilde{h}$ around y . The next step of our Markov chain (X_n, Y_n) is pivoting $L_y X_l$ and $L_y Y_l$ around y . Now, this step can easily be coupled such that if $|L_y X_l(y)|$ increases or decreases, then also does $|L_y Y_l(y)|$. This implies the desired conclusion (42).

We explain now how to construct a coupling that satisfies the statement (43). The auxiliary Lemma 4.19 from below states that

$$P(X_l, y) \leq P(Y_l, y), \quad (44)$$

where $P(X_l, y)$ is the probability that y is a true minimum of X_n after resampling of the edges around x . The quantity $P(Y_n, y)$ is defined analogously. It is a direct consequence of (44) is that there is a coupling of the resampling step L_y such that (43) is satisfied: One throws a random variable U that is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. If $U \leq P(X_n, x)$ one decides that both $L_y X_l$ and $L_y Y_l$ will have a true local minimum around y , and $L_y X_l$ and $L_y Y_l$ are chosen uniformly among those states. If $P(X_l, y) \leq U \leq P(Y_l, y)$ one decides that only $L_y Y_l$ will have a true local minimum around y , but not $L_y X_l$. And finally if $P(Y_l, y) \leq U \leq 1$, one decides that both $L_y X_l$ and $L_y Y_l$ will not have a true local minimum around y . This completes the argument. $\square$

In the proof of Lemma 4.8 we used the following auxiliary statement.

Lemma 4.19. *Let $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$ such that*

$$\max_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^m} ||h_u(y)| - |h_d(y)|| \leq 2.$$

Let $x \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ be a local minimum for both h_u and h_d such that

$$|h_u(x)| = |h_d(x)| + 2.$$

Let $L_x h_u \in \mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$ and $L_x h_d \in \mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$ denote the states one obtains after resampling the edges of h_u and h_d around x . Then it holds that

$$P(h_u, x) \leq P(h_d, x), \quad (45)$$

where $P(h_u, x)$ and $P(h_d, x)$ denote the probability that $L_x h_u$ and, respectively, $L_x h_d$ have a true local minimum at x .

Proof of Lemma 4.19. We split up the proof of Lemma 4.19 in several steps. In the first step, we show the following statement that is valid for any element $h \in \mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$. Assume that there are two edges $e_{x,y}$ and $e_{x,z}$ that are not resampleable for h . Then it holds that

$$\tilde{h}(e_{x,y}) = \tilde{h}(e_{x,z}),$$

where $\tilde{h}$ denotes the dual of the graph-homomorphism h (cf. Definition 3.3). The reason is that if an edge is not in an excursion then it is contained in a path to a boundary point of $\mathcal{T}$. However, because $h \in \mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$ is supported on one geodesic there can only be one such path.

In the next step, we show that the following inequality which is an important consequence of Lemma 4.15. Let $E(h, x)$ be the number of different excursions around x for the homomorphism h (see Picture 10 for an example), then it holds that

$$|E(h_d, x)| \leq |E(h_u, x)|. \quad (46)$$

In order to prove this, it is sufficient to show that any edge e_{xy} non-resampleable for h_u is also non-resampleable for h_d and that if two edges e_{xy} and $e_{xy'}$ are in the same excursion for h_u , they must also be in the same excursion for h_d or be both non resampleable. Indeed, the contra position of those two statements is that any set of edges in different excursions for h_d must also be in different excursions for h_u which yields (46).

Let us now show that any edge e_{xy} non-resampleable for h_u is also non-resampleable for h_d . Let e_{xy} be non-resampleable for h_u , we know from Lemma 4.15 that there exist an infinite path $p = \{x_0 = x, x_1 = y, \dots\}$ such that $|h_u(x_i)| > |h_u(x)|$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $|h_u(x)| = |h_d(x)| + 2$ and

$$\max_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n} |h_u(x)| - |h_d(x)| = 2,$$

this also imposes that for all $|h_d(x_i)| > |h_d(x)|$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. This means that e_{xy} cannot be in an excursion for h_d .

Now, let us show if two edges e_{xy} and $e_{xy'}$ are in the same excursion for h_u , they must also be in the same excursion for h_d . It again follows from Lemma 4.15 that if two edges e_{xy} and $e_{xy'}$ are in the same excursion for h_u then there exist a path $p = \{x_0 = x, x_1 = y, \dots, x_{n-1} = y', x_n = x\}$ such that $h_u(x_i) > h_u(x)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. For the same reason as in the previous paragraph, this impose that $|h_d(x_i)| > |h_d(x)|$ for

all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. This yields that either e_{xy} and $e_{xy'}$ are in the same excursion for h_d or both non resampleable for h_d .

In the next step we show that the following statement that is valid for any element $h \in \mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$. Assume that there are two edges $e_{x,y}$ and $e_{x,z}$ that are not resampleable for h . Then it holds that

$$\tilde{h}(e_{x,y}) = \tilde{h}(e_{x,z}),$$

where $\tilde{h}$ denotes the dual of the graph-homomorphism h (cf. Definition 3.3). The reason is that if an edge is not in an excursion then it is contained in a path to a boundary point of $\mathcal{T}$. However, because $h \in \mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$ is supported on one geodesic there can only be one such path.

Using the previous steps, one can deduce the following formula for an arbitrary element $h \in \mathcal{H}_n^g(s)$

$$P(h, x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d^{|E(h,x)|-1}}, & \text{if all edges are resampleable;} \\ \frac{1}{d^{|E(h,x)|}}, & \text{if there is a non resampleable edge.} \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

Now, the desired estimate (45) follows from a case distinction with the help of the estimate (46) and the formula (47).

Let us consider the first case, in which there is a non resampleable edge for $h_u(x)$. We have shown above that then there is also a non resampleable edge for $h_d x$. Hence, it follows from a combination of (46) and (47) that

$$P(h_u, x) = \frac{1}{d^{|E(h_u)|}} \leq \frac{1}{d^{|E(h_d)|}} = P(h_d, x).$$

Let us now consider the second case, namely that all edges are resampleable for $h_u(x)$ and resampleable for $h_d(x)$. In this case, a combination of (46) and (47) yields that

$$P(h_u, x) = \frac{1}{d^{|E(h_u)|-1}} \leq \frac{1}{d^{|E(h_d)|-1}} = P(h_d, x).$$

Let us now consider the last case in which all edges are resampleable for $h_u(x)$ and there is a non resampleable edge for $h_d(x)$. In this case it follows that

$$|E(h_d, x)| + 1 \leq |E(h_u, x)|. \quad (48)$$

Using (48), (46) and (47) yields that

$$P(h_u, x) = \frac{1}{d^{|E(h_u)|-1}} \leq \frac{1}{d^{|E(h_d)|}} \leq P(h_d, x),$$

which closes the argument. $\square$

5. EXISTENCE OF A CONTINUUM OF SHIFT-INVARIANT ERGODIC GRADIENT GIBBS MEASURES

The concentrations results obtained in the previous section carry important information about the set $ex\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}^m, \mathcal{T}_d)$ of ergodic gradient Gibbs measures for the shift of $\mathbb{Z}^m$. In order to make our statement precise, we begin with recalling some classical results about Gibbs measures for discrete systems. They can be all found in [Geo88].

Definition 5.1 (Slope). *Let ν be an ergodic gradient Gibbs measure then for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ the limit*

$$s_i(\nu) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n\vec{e}_i))$$

exists ν -almost surely and we call $(s_1(\nu), \dots, s_m(\nu))$ the slope of ν .

Since every shift-invariant Gibbs measure on $\text{hom}(\mathbb{Z}^m, \mathcal{T}_d)$ can be decomposed into an ergodic gradient Gibbs measures. This allows to define the slope of a shift-invariant Gibbs measure in the following way:

Definition 5.2. *Let us assume that μ is a shift-invariant Gibbs measure. Then the slope $(s_1(\mu), \dots, s_m(\mu))$ of μ is*

$$s_i(\mu) = \int_{ex\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}^m, \mathcal{T}_d)} s_i(\nu) w_{\mu}(d\nu),$$

where w_{μ} is the ergodic decomposition of μ . This means that for any test function f it holds that

$$\int f(x) \mu(dx) = \int_{ex\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}^m, \mathcal{T}_d)} \int f(x) \nu(dx) w_{\mu}(d\nu).$$

We will now show how the concentration results (34) obtained in Section 4 imply the existence of an ergodic gradient Gibbs measure for each slope s whose l_1 -norm is less or equal to 1.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $(s_1, \dots, s_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be such that $s_1 + \dots + s_m \leq 1$. Then there exist a sequence of n -invariant homomorphisms $\{h_n \in \mathcal{H}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with slope $(\frac{\lfloor s_1 n \rfloor}{n}, \dots, \frac{\lfloor s_m n \rfloor}{n})$*

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of the Kirszbraun theorem. for all $(k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$, set $h(k_1 n, \dots, k_m n) = \Pi_{\mathbf{g}}((k_1 \lfloor s_1 n \rfloor + \dots + k_m \lfloor s_m n \rfloor))$. Since $\mathbf{g}$ is isomorphic to a 2-regular tree, we can apply the Kirszbraun theorem between $\mathbb{Z}^m$ and $\mathbf{g}$. Hence there exist an extension of h on the whole space $\mathbb{Z}^m$ which is entirely supported on the geodesic $\mathbf{g}$. The slope of this extension must be $(\frac{\lfloor s_1 n \rfloor}{n}, \dots, \frac{\lfloor s_m n \rfloor}{n})$ which concludes our proof. $\square$

Theorem 5.4. *For all $(s_1, \dots, s_m) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ such that $s_1 + \dots + s_m \leq 1$, there exist an ergodic gradient Gibbs measure μ with slope $(s_1, \dots, s_m)$.*

Proof. We already know from the previous lemma that $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(\frac{\lfloor s_1 n \rfloor}{n}, \dots, \frac{\lfloor s_m n \rfloor}{n})$ is non empty for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By compactness of the space of gradient Gibbs measures, we know that there exist a subsequence of

$$\{\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(\frac{\lfloor s_1 n \rfloor}{n}, \dots, \frac{\lfloor s_m n \rfloor}{n})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}},$$

which converges to a gradient Gibbs measure μ on $\mathbb{Z}^m$. The shift invariance of the measure follows from the shift invariance of the spaces $\mathcal{H}_n^{\mathbf{g}}(\frac{\lfloor s_1 n \rfloor}{n}, \dots, \frac{\lfloor s_m n \rfloor}{n})$. Suppose, by contradiction that the slope is not almost surely equal to $(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ on the average w_μ . Then there exist $i \in \{1..m\}$ and ϵ such that $w_\mu(|s_i(\nu) - s_i| \geq \epsilon) \geq \delta$. We know from the proof of Theorem 4.4 that for all $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(|d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) - \mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n))]| \geq \varepsilon n) \leq C e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{2^{10}}}.$$

Dividing by n we can rewrite this inequality as

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) \right] \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq C e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{2^{10}}}$$

and thus it holds on the one hand that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) \right] \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) \right] \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\text{ex}\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}^m, \mathcal{T}_d)} \mathbb{P}_\nu \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) \right] \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) w_\mu(d\nu) \\
&\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{|s_i(\nu) - s_i| \geq \varepsilon\}} \mathbb{P}_\nu \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) \right] \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) w_\mu(d\nu) \\
&\geq \int_{\{|s_i(\nu) - s_i| \geq \varepsilon\}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\nu \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(0), h(n)) \right] \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) w_\mu(d\nu) \\
&\geq \delta,
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, the slope is w_μ -almost surely equal to $(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ and there exist at least one ergodic gradient Gibbs measure with slope $(s_1, \dots, s_m)$. $\square$

It is also possible to define the slope in a similar way for any graph $\mathcal{G}$ whose universal cover is a regular tree as described in [Cha16] and obtain the same result characterization of shift-invariant ergodic gradient Gibbs measure.

Corollary 5.5. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a finite d -regular graphs with no four cycle and let $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}^m, \mathcal{G})$ be the space of ergodic gradient Gibbs measures from $\mathbb{Z}^m$ to $\mathcal{G}$ for the shift of $\mathbb{Z}^m$. For all $(s_1, \dots, s_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $s_1 + \dots + s_m \leq 1$ then there exist an ergodic gradient Gibbs measure with slope $s_1, \dots, s_m$.*

Proof. It is known that the d -regular tree is the universal cover of all finite d -regular graphs with no four cycle (see [Cha16]). Let $\mathcal{G}$ be such a graph, the push forward of the measure μ obtained in 5.4 define a shift-invariant Gibbs measure on $\text{hom}(\mathbb{Z}^m, \mathcal{G})$ which conserves the slope (one can choose the image of 0 uniformly among the vertices of $\mathcal{G}$ to conserve the shift invariance). Since this push forward also contract the distance, the concentration inequality (34) still holds and one can use the exact same argument as in 5.4 to show the existence of an ergodic gradient Gibbs measure with slope $(s_1, \dots, s_m)$. $\square$

6. PROOF OF THE VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE

The purpose of this section is to prove the main results of this article, namely Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 2.9. Inspired by the argument of [CKP01], we will first deduce Theorem 2.9 and then deduce from it Theorem 2.7.

The main idea to prove Theorem 2.9 is to establish the desired identity 10 in two steps: In the first step, one underestimates the number of graph homomorphisms $h : R_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ and in the second step one overestimates the number of graph homomorphisms. The tool for underestimating the number of graph homomorphisms is provided in Theorem 3.9. The tool for overestimating the number of graph homomorphisms is provided now.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $S_n \subset \mathbb{Z}^m$ be the $n \times n$ square given by*

$$S_n := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^m \mid \forall i : 0 \leq x_i \leq n-1\}.$$

Let H be the set of homomorphisms $\{h : S_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}\}$ such that

- *0 is mapped to the root $\mathbf{r}$ i.e. $h(0) = \mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{T}$ and*
- *for all $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \partial S_n$ we have*

$$|d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \mathbf{r}) - |s \cdot x|| \leq \epsilon n.$$

Then there is an integer n_0 such that for all $n \geq n_0$

$$-\frac{1}{n^m} \ln |H| = \text{ent}_n(s_1, \dots, s_m) + \theta(\epsilon),$$

where $\text{ent}_n(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ is the local surface tension given by Definition 3.7.

Proof. Let $h \in H$, our goal will be to show that there exist a geodesic segment $\mathbf{s} \subset \mathcal{T}$ such that for all $x \in \partial S_n$

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \mathbf{s}(|s \cdot x|)) \leq 2\epsilon n, \tag{49}$$

where $\mathbf{s}(|sx_1 + \dots + sx_m|) = v$ denotes the unique element $v \in \mathbf{s}$ such that $|v| := d_{\mathcal{T}}(v, \mathbf{r}) = |s \cdot x|$.

Indeed, let us define $\mathbf{s}$ to be the segment of h between the root $h(0) = \mathbf{r}$ and a corner of S_n i.e. $h(\pm n, \dots, \pm n)$. Without loss of generality we choose the corner $h(\pm n, \dots, \pm n)$ and assume that $(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ are all non negative (else one would have to choose another corner). We assume that (49) is not satisfied. Hence, we suppose that there exist $x \in \partial S_n$ that

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \mathbf{s}(|sx_1 + \dots + sx_m|)) > 2\epsilon n.$$

There exist a path $\mathbf{p} \subset \mathbb{Z}^m$ between x and $(n, \dots, n)$ on the boundary of ∂S_n on which all the coordinates are non-decreasing. This means that for all $y \in \mathbf{p}$ we have

$$s_1 x_1 + \dots + s_m x_m \leq s_1 y_1 + \dots + s_m y_m.$$

Now, consider z to be the first point on $\mathbf{p}$ whose image is on $\mathbf{s}$, we must have $|h(z)| < |h(x)| - 2\epsilon n$, where we used the short notation $|h(x)| = d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), h(0))$. A direct calculation yields (cf. the proof of Theorem 4.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\epsilon &< |h(x)| - |h(z)| \\ &= |h(x)| - s \cdot x + s \cdot x - s \cdot y + s \cdot y - |h(z)| \\ &\leq ||h(x)| - s \cdot x| + |s \cdot y - |h(z)|| \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows that either

$$||h(z)| - s \cdot z| > \epsilon n$$

or

$$||h(x)| - s \cdot x| > \epsilon n,$$

which is a contradiction with $h \in H$. This means that for all $h \in H$ we can define a geodesic $\mathbf{g}$ such that $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbf{g}$ and

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}(h(x), \mathbf{g}(\lfloor s x_1 + \dots + s x_m \rfloor)) \leq 2\epsilon n.$$

We observe that on S_n there are less than $d^{n^{m-1}}$ possible distinct boundary graph homomorphisms such that we obtain from Theorem 3.9 that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{n^m} \ln |H| &\geq -\frac{1}{n^m} \log d^{n^{m-1}} + \text{ent}_n(s_1, \dots, s_m) + \theta(\epsilon) \\ &= -\frac{1}{n} \ln d + \text{ent}_n(s_1, \dots, s_m) + \theta(\epsilon) \\ &\geq \text{ent}_n(s_1, \dots, s_m) + \theta(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where we have chosen $n \geq n_0$ large enough in the last step.

The reverse inequality easily follows from Theorem 3.9, by underestimating the elements in H i.e.

$$-\frac{1}{n^m} \ln |H| \leq \text{ent}_n(s_1, \dots, s_m) + \theta(\epsilon),$$

this completes the argument. $\square$

Now, we are ready to state the proof of Theorem 2.9.




FIGURE 13. Illustration of the set R . The grid is the set $R_{\text{grid},\varepsilon}$.




FIGURE 14. Block approximation $\bigcup_k B_k$ of the set R .

Proof of Theorem 2.9. The first step of the proof is to show that one can assume wlog. that the asymptotic height profile (h, a_{ij}) has a simpler structure. For that reason, let us consider the discretized region R_ε given by

$$R_\varepsilon = \{z \in R \mid z \in \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^d\}.$$

Given the asymptotic height profile (h, a_{ij}) , we consider an associated asymptotic height profile (h_ε, a_{ij}) that satisfies the following conditions:

- The first coordinate of $h_{\min,\varepsilon}$ is the linear interpolation of $h_{\min}^1(z)$ with respect to the lattice R_ε .
- The second coordinate of $h_{\min,\varepsilon}$ satisfies the following condition: For all $x \in R_n$ such that $\frac{x}{n} \in R_\varepsilon$ it holds

$$h_{\min,\varepsilon}^2\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) = h_{\min}^2\left(\frac{x}{n}\right).$$

Because the first coordinate h^1 is 1-Lipschitz it follows from the definition (9) of $HP_n(h, \delta)$ that

$$HP_n(h_\varepsilon, 0.5\delta) \subset HP_n(h, \delta) \subset HP_n(h_\varepsilon, 2\delta). \quad (50)$$

We will show below that (10) is satisfied for the linear interpolation h_ε i.e.

$$\text{Ent}(h_\varepsilon) = -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)| + \theta(\varepsilon) + \theta(\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right).$$

We will now argue that then (10) is also satisfied for the original asymptotic height profile $(h, (a_{ij})_{k \times k})$.

We need the following fact. Due to the convexity of the local surface tension $\text{ent}(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ and that $\nabla h_{\min}^1$ is 1-Lipschitz, it holds for a.e. $x \in R$ that

$$\text{ent}(\nabla h_\varepsilon^1(x)) = \text{ent}(\nabla h^1(x)) + o(\varepsilon)$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}(h_\varepsilon) &= \int_R \text{ent}(\nabla h_\varepsilon^1(x)) dx \\ &= \int_R \text{ent}(\nabla h^1(x)) dx + o(\varepsilon) \\ &= \text{Ent}(h). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

As a consequence, we get by combining (50), (10) and (51) that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)| &\leq -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h_\varepsilon, 0.5\delta)| \\ &= \text{Ent}(h_\varepsilon) + \theta(\varepsilon) + \theta(0.5\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right) \\ &= \text{Ent}(h) + \theta(\varepsilon) + \theta(\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right) \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)| &\geq -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h_\varepsilon, 2\delta)| \\ &= \text{Ent}(h_\varepsilon) + \theta(\varepsilon) + \theta(2\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right) \\ &= \text{Ent}(h) + \theta(\varepsilon) + \theta(\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The last two estimates yield the desired conclusion that (10) is also valid for the height profile $(h, (a_{ij})_{k \times k})$.

Hence, it is left to deduce the identity (51). This identity is deduced in two steps. In the first step, we show that

$$-\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)| \leq \int_R \text{ent}(\nabla h^1(z)) dz + \theta(\varepsilon) + \theta(\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \quad (52)$$

In the second step, we show that

$$-\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)| \geq \int_R \text{ent}(\nabla h_\varepsilon^1(z)) dz + \theta(\varepsilon) + \theta(\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \quad (53)$$

Let us turn to the first step i.e. the verification of (52). Because R_n converges to R in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense, we may assume wlog. that $R \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ can be written as a finite union of l_∞ -blocks of side length ε aligned to the grid $R_{\text{grid}, \varepsilon}$ i.e. (see also Figure 13 and Figure 14)

$$R = \bigcup_{k=1}^m B_k. \quad (54)$$

This implies in particular that

$$|R_n| = m \left(1 + \theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \varepsilon^m n^m. \quad (55)$$

In order deduce (52), we have to underestimate the number of graph homomorphism in $HP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)$ for that purpose let us fix an element $g_n \in HP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)$. The graph homomorphism will serve as a boundary condition, fixing the values of a graph homomorphism on the set $R_{\text{grid}, \varepsilon}$ (cf. Figure 13). Hence, we define the set

$$UP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta) := \left\{ h_n \in M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n}) : \forall x \in R_n : \frac{x}{n} \in R_{\text{grid}, \varepsilon} h_n(x) = g_n(x) \right\}.$$

Then it follows from the definition that

$$|HP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)| \geq |UP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)|, \quad (56)$$

which leads to the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)| &\leq -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |UP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)| \\ &= -\frac{1}{m \left(1 + \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \varepsilon^m n^m} \ln |UP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)| \end{aligned}$$

where we used the identity (55) in the last step.

Now the idea is that every block B_k of $R_{\text{grid},\varepsilon}$ becomes independent and can be estimated by itself. In order to estimate the entropy of a block we use Lemma 3.9, which can be applied due to the fact that the function h_ε is linear on the boundary of a block B_k (see also the definition (56) of the set $UP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)$). Hence, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \frac{1}{m \left(1 + \theta \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \varepsilon^m n^m} \ln |UP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)| \\
&= - \frac{1}{m \left(1 + \theta \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right)} \sum_{k=1}^m \left(\text{ent}_{\varepsilon n}(\nabla h_\varepsilon^1(x_k)) + \theta(\delta) + \theta \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right) \\
&= - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \text{ent}_{\varepsilon n}(\nabla h_\varepsilon^1(x_k)) + \theta(\delta) + \theta \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \\
&= - \frac{1}{m \varepsilon^m} \sum_{k=1}^m \varepsilon^m \text{ent}(\nabla h_\varepsilon^1(x_k)) + \theta(\delta) + \theta \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) + \theta \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $x_k \in B_k \subset R$ chosen arbitrary for $1 \leq k \leq m$. By using that due to (54) it holds that $|R| = m \varepsilon^d$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{m \varepsilon^m} \sum_{k=1}^m \varepsilon^m \text{ent}(\nabla h_\varepsilon^1(x_k)) + \theta(\delta) + \theta \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) + \theta \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R \text{ent}(\nabla h_\varepsilon^1(x)) dx + \theta(\delta) + \theta \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) + \theta \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which overall deduces the desired estimate (52).

Let us now turn to the verification of (53). The strategy is to overestimate the number of graph homomorphisms contained in $HP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)$. By having a close look at the definition of $HP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)$, we overestimate the number of graph homomorphisms by looking at the values of a height function on each block B_k independently (see also Figure 13). Hence, Lemma 6.1 from above yields that (by using additionally the

identity (55))

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h_\varepsilon, \delta)| \\
& \geq -\frac{1}{m(1 + \theta(\frac{1}{n}))} \sum_{k=1}^m \left(\text{ent}_{\varepsilon n}(\nabla h_\varepsilon^1(x_k)) + \theta(\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right) \\
& = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \text{ent}_{\varepsilon n}(\nabla h_\varepsilon^1(x_k)) + \theta(\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \\
& = \frac{1}{m\varepsilon^m} \sum_{k=1}^m \varepsilon^m \text{ent}(\nabla h_\varepsilon^1(x_k)) + \theta(\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which is the desired estimate (53) and closes the argument. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.7. We consider a fixed asymptotic boundary height profile $(h_{\partial R}, (a_{ij})_{k \times k})$ and consider the set $AHP(h_{\partial R}, (a_{ij})_{k \times k})$ of all possible extensions to an asymptotic height profile $(h, (a_{ij})_{k \times k})$ (see Definition 2.2). It follows from the definition that

$$AHP(h_{\partial R}, (a_{ij})_{k \times k}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Because the space $AHP(h_{\partial R}, (a_{ij})_{k \times k})$ is closed and the local surface tension ent_n is convex (cf. Theorem 3.2) and uniformly bounded from below by $-d$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{h_R \in SA(h_{\partial R}, a_{ij})} \text{Ent}(R, h_R) &= \min_{h_R \in SA(h_{\partial R}, a_{ij})} \text{Ent}(R, h_R) \\
&= \text{Ent}(R, h_{\min}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $(h_{\min}, a_{ij})$ is the minimizer of the macroscopic entropy $\text{Ent}(R, h_R)$.

Let us fix an $\tilde{\delta} > 0$. We have to show that there exists an integer $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$ it holds

$$\text{Ent}(\Lambda_n, h_{\partial R_n}) \leq \text{Ent}(R, h_{\min}) + \tilde{\delta} \quad (57)$$

and

$$\text{Ent}(\Lambda_n, h_{\partial R_n}) \geq \text{Ent}(R, h_{\min}) - \tilde{\delta}. \quad (58)$$

We start with deducing the estimate (57). The identity (10) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}(\Lambda_n, h_{\partial R_n}) &= -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n})| \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h_{\min, \varepsilon}, \delta)| \\ &= \text{Ent}(R, h_{\min}) + \theta(\varepsilon) + \theta(\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing now first $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ small, and then n large (depending on ε) yields the desired upper bound (57).

Let us now deduce the lower bound (58). Using compactness we know that for a fixed number $\delta > 0$, there is a integer l , depending on δ but not on n , and asymptotic height profiles $h_1, \dots, h_l$ such that

$$M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n}) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^l HP_n(h_i, \delta). \quad (59)$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that the functions $h_1 = h_{\min, \varepsilon}$, where $h_{\min, \varepsilon}$ was defined above. From the definition of $h_{\min, \varepsilon}$ and Theorem 3.9 it follows that (cf. 6)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}(R, h_{\min, \varepsilon}) &= -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h_{\min, \varepsilon}, \delta)| \\ &= \text{Ent}(R, h_{\min}) + \theta(\delta) \\ &\leq \text{Ent}(R, h_i) + \theta(\delta) \\ &= -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |HP_n(h_i, \delta)| + \theta(\delta) \end{aligned}$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. The last inequality yields that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$

$$|HP_n(h_i, \delta)| \leq |HP_n(h_{\min, \varepsilon}, \delta)| \exp(|R_n| \theta(\delta)).$$

This yields in combination with (10) and (59) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Ent}(\Lambda_n, h_{\partial R_n}) &= -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln |M(R_n, h_{\partial R_n})| \\
&\geq -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln \sum_{i=1}^l |HP_n(h_i, \delta)| \\
&\geq -\frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln (l |HP_n(h_1, \delta)|) \\
&= \text{Ent}(R, h_{\min}) + \theta(\varepsilon) + \theta(\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon n}\right) - \frac{1}{|R_n|} \ln l \\
&\geq \text{Ent}(R, h_{\min}) + \theta(\varepsilon) + \theta(\delta) + \theta\left(\frac{\ln l}{\varepsilon n}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing now first $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ small and then n large enough (depending on ε and l) verifies the lower bound (58) and finishes the argument. $\square$

7. OPEN PROBLEM

We know that the variational problem given by our variational principle has a minimizer (cf. Theorem 2.7). However, we do not prove that this minimizing limiting profile is unique. The uniqueness of the minimizer would follow if the local surface tension is strictly convex. This would also allow to show that the concentrations tails are not only exponential but in fact Gaussian. We conjecture that the surface tension is strictly convex. Additionally we conjecture that the convexity at a given slope increases when the degree of the tree increases.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors want to thank Marek Biskup, Nishant Chandgotia, Richard Kenyon and Igor Pak for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [Azu67] Kazuoki Azuma. Weighted sums of certain dependent random variables. *Tôhoku Math. J. (2)*, 19:357–367, 1967.
- [CEP96] Henry Cohn, Noam Elkies, and James Propp. Local statistics for random domino tilings of the Aztec diamond. *Duke Math. J.*, 85(1):117–166, 1996.
- [Cer06] R. Cerf. *The Wulff crystal in Ising and percolation models*, volume 1878 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. Lectures

- from the 34th Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 6–24, 2004, With a foreword by Jean Picard.
- [Cha16] Nishant Chandgotia. Four-cycle free graphs, height functions, the pivot property and entropy minimality. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, FirstView:1–31, 3 2016.
 - [CKP01] Henry Cohn, Richard Kenyon, and James Propp. A variational principle for domino tilings. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 14(2):297–346 (electronic), 2001.
 - [DKS92] R. Dobrushin, R. Kotecký, and S. Shlosman. *Wulff construction*, volume 104 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1992. A global shape from local interaction, Translated from the Russian by the authors.
 - [Dur10] Rick Durrett. *Probability: theory and examples*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, fourth edition, 2010.
 - [FS06] Patrik L. Ferrari and Herbert Spohn. Scaling limit for the space-time covariance of the stationary totally asymmetric simple exclusion process. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 265(1):1–44, 2006.
 - [Geo88] Hans-Otto Georgii. *Gibbs measures and phase transitions*, volume 9 of *de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1988.
 - [Hoe63] Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 58:13–30, 1963.
 - [Kas63] P. W. Kasteleyn. Dimer statistics and phase transitions. *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 4:287–293, 1963.
 - [Kir34] M. Kirszbraun. Über die zusammenziehende und Lipschitzsche Transformationen. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 22(1):77–108, 1934.
 - [KK92] Claire Kenyon and Richard Kenyon. Tiling a polygon with rectangles. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 1992. Proceedings., 33rd Annual Symposium on*, pages 610–619. IEEE, 1992.
 - [Klo08] Benot Kloeckner. On Lipschitz compactifications of trees. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 346(7):413 – 416, 2008.
 - [KOS06] Richard Kenyon, Andrei Okounkov, and Scott Sheffield. Dimers and amoebae. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 163(3):1019–1056, 2006.
 - [LP08] Lionel Levine and Yuval Peres. Strong spherical asymptotics for rotor-router aggregation and the divisible sandpile. *Potential Analysis*, 30(1):1, 2008.
 - [LRS01] Michael Luby, Dana Randall, and Alistair Sinclair. Markov chain algorithms for planar lattice structures. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 31(1):167–192, 2001.
 - [LS77] B. F. Logan and L. A. Shepp. A variational problem for random Young tableaux. *Advances in Math.*, 26(2):206–222, 1977.
 - [PR07] Boris Pittel and Dan Romik. Limit shapes for random square Young tableaux. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 38(2):164–209, 2007.
 - [PST16] Igor Pak, Adam Sheffer, and Martin Tassy. Fast domino tileability. *Discrete Comput Geom*, 56(2):377–394, 2016.
 - [Sch69] J. T. Schwartz. *Nonlinear functional analysis*. Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York-London-Paris, 1969. Notes by H. Fattorini, R. Nirenberg and H. Porta, with an additional chapter by Hermann Karcher, Notes on Mathematics and its Applications.

- [She02] Scott Sheffield. Ribbon tilings and multidimensional height functions. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 354(12):4789–4813, 2002.
- [She05] Scott Sheffield. Random surfaces. *Astérisque*, (304):vi+175, 2005.
- [Tas14] Martin Tassy. *Translation invariant Gibbs measure on tilings*. In preparation, Brown University, 2014.
- [Val43] F. A. Valentine. On the extension of a vector function so as to preserve a Lipschitz condition. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 49:100–108, 1943.
- [VK77] A. M. Vershik and S. V. Kerov. Asymptotic behavior of the Plancherel measure of the symmetric group and the limit form of Young tableaux. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 233(6):1024–1027, 1977.
- [Wil04] David Bruce Wilson. Mixing times of lozenge tiling and card shuffling markov chains. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 14(1):274–325, 02 2004.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
E-mail address: gmenz@math.ucla.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
E-mail address: mtassy@math.ucla.edu